DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 619 95 SP 011 275

AUTHOR Pipes, Lana, Ed.
TITLE Teacher Centers as an Approach to Staff Development in Special Education.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Rhode Island State Dept. of Education, Providence.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Finance; *Exceptional Child Education; Federal Aid; *Handicapped Students; Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Program Evaluation; Resource Centers; *Special Education; *Staff Improvement; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education; *Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

This publication chronicles the activities at the June 1977 conference sponsored by the Rhode Island Teacher Center to explore the teacher center model as a means of meeting staff development requirements of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The stated objectives of the conference were as follows: (1) to acquaint professionals in special education programs with the teacher center model as a staff development delivery system; (2) to acquaint professionals in preservice and inservice education with the staff development requirements detailed in the "Comprehensive System of Personnel Development" section of Public Law 94-142; (3) to bring together both types of professionals to discuss such issues as roles, responsibilities, needs, and resources to fulfill the mandates of PL 94-142 and the teacher center section of PL 94-482; (4) to provide an overview of the products, practices, and research knowledge base available in these areas; and (5) to present a forum for discussing the regulations for teacher centers authorized by recent federal legislation. (JD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ERIC

CLEARINGHOUSE
ON
TEACHER
EDUCATION

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL
SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

ED143619

Teacher Centers as an Approach to Staff Development in Special Education

011 225

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Conference Report
Rhode Island Teacher Center

Newport, Rhode Island
June 5-7, 1977

Teacher Centers as an Approach to Staff Development in Special Education

Rhode Island Teacher Center
Conference Report

Newport, Rhode Island
June 5-7, 1977

EDWARD L. DAMBRUCH
Director
Rhode Island Teacher Center

JEWEL CHAMBERS
Project Officer

ALLEN A. SCHMIEDER
Program Officer

U.S. Office of Education

Conference Sponsors:

Rhode Island Teacher Center
Rhode Island Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

U.S. Office of Education
Division of Educational Systems Development
Washington, D.C. 20202

Published by:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

August 1977
SP 011 275

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of AACTE, the Clearinghouse, or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

		see page
FOREWORD		vii
INTRODUCTION		1
PROGRAM		
Sunday, June 5		
3:00 - 5:00	Registration — Main Lobby	
6:00 - 7:00	Social Hour — Pool Terrace	
Monday, June 6		
8:30 - 9:00	Registration — Main Lobby	
9:00 - 9:15	GREETINGS — Main Ballroom	2
	Dr. Edward L. Dambruch, Director of the Rhode Island Teacher Center	
	Dr. Thomas C. Schmidt, Commissioner of Education, State of Rhode Island	
9:15 - 10:00	CONFERENCE KEYNOTE	3
	When Are We Going To Get Serious About Inservice Education?	
	Dr. Bruce Balow, Professor of Special Education, University of Minnesota	
10:00 - 10:15	Coffee Break	
10:15 - 11:45	FEDERAL PERSPECTIVES	
	Teacher Center Regulations	6
	Dr. Allen Schmieder, Chief, Support Programs/Director, Teacher Center Program	
	PL 94-142 Education for the Handicapped Regulations	13
	Dr. Jasper Harvey, Director, Division of Personnel Preparation, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped	
	QUESTIONS AND DIALOG	

11:45 - 1:00	Lunch		
1:00 - 2:45	ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, NEEDS, ISSUES, RECOMMENDATIONS (Small Group Discussions)		15
2:45 - 3:00	Coffee and Coke Break	Ballroom	
3:00 - 3:45	GENERAL SESSION Report Small Group Sessions	Ballroom	
	GROUP A		15
	GROUP B		16
	GROUP C		16
	GROUP D		16
	GROUP E		17
	General Recommendations		17
	Questions for Further Consideration		17

Tuesday, June 7

9:00 - 10:00	PANEL RESPONSE AND DIALOG (Issues Generated by Small Group Discussions)	Ballroom	18
	Ms. Patti Bourexis, Dr. Allen Schmieder, Dr. Bruce Balow, Mr. Charles Harrington, Mr. Ronald DiOrio		
10:00 - 10:15	Coffee Break		
10:15 - 11:15	THE RHODE ISLAND TEACHER CENTER MODEL		22
	Implementations of Special Education Staff Development		
	Dr. Edward L. Dambruch, Director, Rhode Island Teacher Center		23
	Ms. Mary Costello, Consultant, Special Education, Rhode Island Department of Education		24
	Ms. Judy DiMeo, Coordinator, Staff Development Project, Rhode Island College		26
	COLLABORATION FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION		27
	Ms. Lana Pipes, Editor of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, interviews Ms. Mary Costello		
11:15 - 12:15	SMALL GROUP WORKSHOPS		
	Child Find	Stern Room	35
	Ms. Judith Siegel, Child Find Consultant, Rhode Island Department of Education		

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) — Room 125 — 36

Mr. Hopkin Davies, Assistant Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

Individualized Education Program — America's Cup Room — 37

Dr. Richard Dickson, Rhode Island College

Teachers' Centers Exchange — Rogers Roost — 38

Ms. Lorraine Keeney and Dr. William Hering, Teachers' Centers Exchange, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

Professional Associations/PL 94-142 — Ballroom — 39

Mr. Ronald DiOrio, President, NEA of Rhode Island

Training Programs - Mainstreaming Elementary and Secondary Principals — Ballroom — 40

Ms. Mary Costello, Consultant, Special Education, Rhode Island Department of Education

Regional Resource Centers — Seaside — 41

Ms. Judy DiMeo, Coordinator, Staff Development Project, Rhode Island College

Due Process — Ballroom — 41

Mr. Richard Flynn, legal consultant for State Departments of Education in New Jersey and Rhode Island

1:30 - 2:15 SECOND SESSION
Repeat Small Group Workshops

2:30 Conference Adjournment

APPENDIX A - TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS (Excerpts) 45

APPENDIX B - EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (Excerpts) 47

APPENDIX C - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 51

READER RESPONSE 56

FOREWORD

This publication chronicles the activities, planned and informal, at the June 1977 conference sponsored by the Rhode Island Teacher Center to explore the teacher center model as a means of meeting the staff development requirements of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act.

The Rhode Island Teacher Center, a program supported by the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education, is one of three teacher center pilot projects completing their final year of funding under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA). Dr. Edward L. Dambruch is Director of the RITC, a statewide model housed in the Rhode Island Department of Education. Other federally funded pilot teacher centers are the Bay Area Learning Center, a regional center in California serving Oakland, San Francisco, and Berkeley (Dr. John Favors, Coordinator); and the Texas Center for Improvement of Educational Systems, a statewide program (Dr. Kyle Killough, Director). Directors of the pilot projects decided that conferences to examine issues in planning and operating teacher centers would help to synthesize their experiences and contribute to future development of teacher centers.*

In the past year, RITC and the Rhode Island Department of Education have initiated collaborative efforts to deliver inservice education in several essential areas--including special education--through the capacity of the teacher center system. Ms. Mary Costello, Consultant in Special Education for the State Department of Education, worked with RITC and with Rhode Island College to develop multiphase inservice programs that (a) foster awareness of the implications of PL 94-142 and sensitize teachers and administrators to the need for special skills for responding to the law's mandates; (b) develop the skills and problem-solving competencies needed; and (c) provide technical assistance for implementing those skills.

Their successful experience formed the unifying basis for this conference combining two federal priorities, teacher centers and provision of an appropriate education for handicapped children. Conference planners hoped:

--To acquaint professionals in special education programs with the teacher center model as a staff development delivery system

--To acquaint professionals in preservice and inservice education with the staff development requirements detailed in the "Comprehensive System of Personnel Development" section of PL 94-142

--To bring together both types of professionals to discuss such issues as roles, responsibilities, needs, and resources to fulfill the mandates of PL 94-142 and the teacher center section of PL 94-482

* A conference sponsored by the Bay Area Learning Center, Oakland, California, in February 1977 was reported in: Validated Products From Theory to Practice. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education (in cooperation with the Bay Area Learning Center and the Division of Educational Systems Development, U.S. Office of Education), May 1977.

--To provide an overview of the products, practices, and research knowledge base available in these areas

--To present a forum for discussing the regulations for teacher centers authorized by recent federal legislation (Section 532 of PL 94-482, the Education Amendments of 1976).**

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, as part of its mission to disseminate vital information in the areas of preservice and continuing education of school personnel, prepared this report on the varied activities of the conference from written and oral presentations. The Clearinghouse acknowledges with gratitude the contributions of all who helped in the compilation and revision of this publication. Comments from readers are welcome. A reader response page at the end of this publication also invites the submission of manuscripts to be considered for inclusion in ERIC.

Karl Massanari, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Teacher Education

**Proposed publication date for the federal teacher center regulations is October 15, 1977. For copies of these regulations, write to the Teacher Center Program, Room 5652, Regional Office Building #3, U.S. Office of Education, 7th and D Streets, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years, federal projects in Rhode Island, California, and Texas have helped to pioneer the teacher center concept in the United States. With the recent enactment of federal legislation authorizing funds to plan, establish, and operate such centers in local education sites across the nation, the three projects embarked on an effort to synthesize and disseminate the information and experiences they have gained.

In the final year of federal funding, the Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC), a statewide model, applied the capacity of its established systems for delivering inservice education to the development of personnel for such categorical areas as special education, vocational education, the Right To Read program, and other state inservice priorities. Because of these initial steps in merging the state's existin, resources for inservice education with the center's staff development model, the RITC elected to sponsor a conference devoted to the specific problem of using teacher centers to provide inservice staff development for educating handicapped children in the regular classroom.

The conference was thus timely in its melding of two current federal thrusts: (a) support for the teacher center movement in the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482), extending the Higher Education Act of 1965; and (b) the mandate for the education of all handicapped children "in the least restrictive environment" (Public Law 94-142).

Participants were brought together from the two fields of expertise, with the hope that from their presentations and group meetings would emanate a commitment to utilizing an innovative model for inservice education--the teacher center--as a tool to gain new knowledge and skills for a definite identified need--learning how to meet the challenge of implementing PL 94-142. This publication reports the activities and discussions of the conference. It was developed from formal presentations, reports from small meetings, presenters' notes, and an interview with Ms. Mary Costello.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education has prepared the report in cooperation with the Rhode Island Teacher Center, in an effort to translate some of the wealth of existing information into practical knowledge for use in individual local school district settings. The informal give-and-take has been retained here to convey the spirit of sharing at the conference.

GREETINGS

Dr. Edward L. Dambruch, Director of the Rhode Island Teacher Center, was coordinator of the conference, and host Sunday evening at a get-acquainted social hour designed to encourage the exchange of ideas for conference consideration. At the beginning of the first General Session Monday morning, he again greeted participants, and introduced Dr. Thomas C. Schmidt, Rhode Island Commissioner of Education, who welcomed participants to the state.

DR. THOMAS SCHMIDT

Dr. Schmidt noted that the Rhode Island Teacher Center (RITC) is a statewide model, and as such has been an instrument for providing inservice education to Rhode Island teachers in various disciplines. He lauded the cooperation during the past year between the RITC and the State Department of Education's Special Education unit.

The speaker saw teacher centers as a place where "there is excitement, there is education, and there is growth and a new future, not only for the teacher but for the child who will be working with that teacher." He described the teacher center movement as "an approach to teacher training and adult education that is human--it takes people where they are, on a volunteer basis, considers their concerns and interests, and treats them as adults professional enough to be able to make their own decisions about what they need."

He noted that the conference would explore two important considerations:

1. The teacher center as a process for providing information for the massive national thrust in special education
2. The transmission of essential content about the needs, aspirations, and processes of teaching and working with children who have special needs.

"The need teachers have for this information is extraordinary; but even more important is the capacity of these teachers to see each child as a contributor, not merely the recipient of the educational process. When education becomes dull, when it becomes irrelevant to the needs of children or the society, then education becomes a one-way dump of information on people. But when education becomes two-way communication, when the teacher looks upon the mildly or severely retarded child or the child with handicaps as a special human being, with special insights on the world of learning, special viewpoints on what life is all about, and special ways of teaching peers and teachers--when the teacher understands all that, the educational process will have flowered.

"That is the challenge, and that is what we must try to bring to the educational process. I believe the teacher center concept has the capacity to provide tools efficiently and thoroughly; we must discover whether it has the capacity to promote this interactive, two-way learning that is true education in a situation as overwhelmingly challenging as we will find special education in the next three to five years."

WHEN ARE WE GOING TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT INSERVICE EDUCATION?

Patti Bourexis, a doctoral candidate in Special Education Administration at Syracuse University, introduced the keynote speaker, Dr. Bruce Balow, Professor of Special Education at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

DR. BRUCE BALOW

Dr. Balow outlined four major areas for consideration:

1. Inservice education--separate from teacher centers or special education
2. New demands that relate to PL 94-142
3. Models of inservice education which place teacher centers in context
4. Suggestions which relate to some of these issues.

Inservice Education

"Complaints about the professional preparation of teachers--particularly preservice--are as deserved as similar comments about other areas of professional development. Colleges and universities provide an entree, the background that gets a person a job. The knowledge and skills delivered to professionals in preparation are blunted enormously by the circumstances in which they try to put these tools to work.

"Teachers complain that inservice education is dull, irrelevant, pedestrian, repetitious, unfocused, obvious, and in many instances does not touch upon the particular problem the teacher has. Oftentimes, the complaint is that someone else decides what it should be and when it should be done. The administrative hierarchy takes control, either in schools, colleges, and universities or in the state department of education, and teachers have little to say about the nature or content of a particular inservice program offered.

"Viewed from a policy perspective, inservice education is scattered, unsystematic; there is no way to make a major impact by taking on one teacher at a time, whether at a school, a college, or a state department of education. If only one teacher attends, and then goes back into that social system where there are 25, 50, or 100 other teachers, the inservice education won't make one bit of difference.

"In the past decade we have asked an enormous amount of teachers. We have asked them to change on every imaginable dimension. Now we want the school systems and the teachers to teach about human relations and human reproduction; we want them to teach about drugs, alcohol, and other social ills. We want driver education, vocational training, back-to-basic skills; and we want social skills--everything from typewriting to tapdancing. We are asking teachers and the school systems to reach out, far beyond what the traditional educational system was ever intended to do. Part of the problem in inservice education is that its claims, either implicit or explicit, are almost always focused on such practicalities. We claim that tomorrow in the classroom life will be different--and we can't deliver.

"We need to recognize that entry level preparation is simply that. Once on the job, the personal needs become apparent. Your needs as a teacher differ from my needs as a teacher. There are some commonalities, but only as we plan inservice education to respond to personal needs rather than to commonalities do we elicit some hope of change."

Demands of PL 94-142

"Special educators regard this legislation as an enormously positive movement. Regular educators aren't sure; they are wary of more 'regulations from people on the outside.' They are thinking, 'Not only do I have to do all the other things that people want me to do, but now I have to reach out and include in my 30 students two or three or four students who weren't in school before, or who were in special classes. Not only do I have to do something with them, but I have to do it by the numbers, numbers from somebody in the state department or representing the federal government.'

"Education for all handicapped children is another in a long list of demands on the schools for new goals and new procedures. I would suggest a more constructive way of viewing this legislation. Public Law 94-142 mandates that everyone be included in the schools. We have long lived lies, saying that public education is mandatory for everybody within certain ages. But if a youngster isn't toilet trained, he doesn't get into school. If he has some difficulty speaking but is nearly six, he doesn't get into school. If he isn't socialized, he doesn't get into school, despite the fact that the law says everyone shall be educated. An estimated one million children are excluded from school for a variety of reasons, some relating to handicaps.

"There are some highly specific requirements in PL 94-142: teacher/parent joint decisions, rather than teacher/administrator joint decisions; nondiscriminatory testing; individualized education programs. Procedural safeguards are the most significant element in PL 94-142 because they give people the right to defend themselves, to have an opportunity to respond to charges against them. The concept of education in the least restrictive alternative, sometimes known as mainstreaming, is part of the law also.

"Regular educators will require a tremendous amount of inservice work to implement PL 94-142. They are not alone in needing help; those of us in special education, who have been operating a separate system of education for so long, need inservice experiences as well."

Inservice Models

"The teacher center is not completely unique; it is part of a history, part of a system of inservice education. A list of other models might include:

1. The after-hours class that colleges or universities typically offer: one teacher from a district attends, 30 or 40 teachers in the same classroom
2. The special workshop: it can be for a day, a week, or six weeks, but is usually offered through some kind of crediting system

3. The Houston, Texas, model to try to provide inservice education for as many teachers as possible: establishing a learning center through which groups of teachers cycle for skills retraining at special stations on classroom management and individualized instruction
4. The more explicit special station model in special programs such as remedial reading: a dozen teachers are brought in to work with 100 children for a year, then return to the regular classroom
5. The itinerant special teacher--who is particularly knowledgeable about children, problems, materials, and techniques and who has skills to consult with other adults: the itinerant teacher moves from classroom to classroom, working with the teacher to demonstrate what can or should be done for a given child.

"In every one of these systems, after the flurry of excitement is over, only one person is left with the kids with the problems, and that's the classroom teacher. Rarely, if ever, does the system get serious about providing that teacher with constant continuing help. The teacher center model contains pieces of all the other models listed, but has some additional, very special characteristics.

"The teacher center is an opportunity, not an answer; it is a joint effort of a local education agency, an institution of higher education, and a state education agency. It multiplies and combines resources, and makes them accessible. It transfers some of the power from the normal authority structure to the teacher--from the college to the school administration directly to the teacher.

"The teacher center makes professional development a responsibility of the profession. It also provides opportunities for low-risk efforts. When inservice education is arranged through the administrative hierarchy, a teacher has to admit difficulty, either implicitly or explicitly, in order to be involved in the program. The teacher center can remove that risk. Finally, it offers an opportunity to influence colleges of education, both directly and indirectly, to change their style of doing things."

Some Suggestions

"When are we going to get serious about attacking the system? If we don't attack a system, if we don't take on buildings or school districts rather than individual teachers as the client, how can we realistically expect change? The school is a social system, a bureaucracy, a subculture; it not only has written rules and regulations, it also has mores, a way of behaving. One does not violate that way of behaving without risk.

"The processes of decision ought to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Teachers don't always know best what they need to know, but they should clearly contribute to decisions. How do decisions about programs get made in a school district of 5000 teachers? Who decides in a school district of 100 teachers? The decision-making process is critical. I argue very strongly that people on the line--teachers, administrators, state agencies--don't have all the answers, no more than does the university. Decision making needs to be inclusive, and I want to be included when the decisions are made.

When are we going to get serious about what is going on in the schools? Decisions in the classroom are often made on emotions not acknowledged. Inservice education won't compensate for that. Consider inservice education in the light of an ecological problem. In inservice education, what you do to influence the ecology of the situation is more important than the manipulation of the teacher.

"When are we going to get serious about educational methods? We have more science, more technology, more art, more skill, more creativity in education today than ever before. Most teachers know how to teach about ten times better than they teach, but they don't have all the procedures and processes under their command. To teach an adult is an expensive process, and clinically supervised education is the most expensive. It is not cost efficient, so we educate in classes of 30 or 40 or 100 and we give lectures--not because the lecture is the be-all and end-all of education, but because that's all the resources we have.

"When are we going to get serious about influencing the resources teachers have available to them? How will the state get from the federal government adequate resources to mount a serious program of inservice education for the thousands of regular teachers who not only don't know much about handicapped youngsters but don't want to know much about them at the moment?

"Teachers need to be politicians. If you're not working with your state legislators and your federal congressperson, you'd better start, because the decisions that make a difference in education are made at that level."

FEDERAL PERSPECTIVES

Dr. Dambruch called attention to excerpts from federal legislation pertaining to teacher centers and to proposed regulations for the Education of All Handicapped Children Act. Pertinent parts of those documents, included in the registration packets distributed to all participants, are appended to this conference report. Dr. Allen Schmieder, Chief of Support Programs in the Division of Educational Systems Development and Program Director for the Teacher Center Program, and Dr. Jasper Harvey, Director of Personnel Preparation for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, both with the U.S. Office of Education, spoke on the federal perspectives of the two pieces of legislation.

DR. ALLEN SCHMIEDER: "Proposed Teacher Center Regulations"
(Public Law 94-482, Section 532)

Dr. Schmieder spoke first of the reasons for convening the conference. He said those involved with the federal teacher center pilot projects had sought, in the final year of funding under the Education Professions Development Act, ways to synthesize their experience and at the same time help to lay the groundwork for new programs and new legislation ahead. Because the successful implementation of the new handicapped legislation--especially the "mainstreaming" portion--will require a great deal of staff development and the teacher

center is one of the best approaches to staff development, it was felt that bringing together personnel active in the two programs could have beneficial outcomes for both teacher centers and special education.

Among the expectations he listed for the conference were:

1. Opportunity to brief interested educators--and receive feedback--on the legislation and proposed regulations for both programs
2. Presentation of several staff development models--including some with teacher center involvement--to participants
3. Beginning of new linkages between special education and teacher centers
4. Explanation of ways in which teacher centers can help implement new educational concepts and approaches, for example, "mainstreaming"
5. Meeting of participants' specific conference expectations
6. Laying the groundwork for a publication on the implications of teacher centers for special education and vice versa.

Regarding the availability of support for staff development and the need for teacher educators to relate more closely to various categorical programs, the speaker said, "Before 1965, we had very little federal money [for such programs]. The Office of Education budget, for example, jumped from $600 million in 1964 to nearly $6 billion in 1965. It is estimated that, considering all federal agencies, there is $20 billion available in 1977 for staff development of one kind or another. So there is more federal money, not less, but it carries stranger and stranger labels, and teacher educators are finding it harder to get hold of it.

"This conference is part of an effort to summarize the experience of three USOE pilot projects--especially as it relates to how teacher centers can help in the implementation of the new federally sponsored special education programs."

Special Education

He called the new legislation on education for the handicapped, PL 94-142, "possibly the most progressive federally sponsored education legislation in history. I'm convinced that everyone has the capacity for genius, and that our educational system should find ways to individualize instruction so this potential can be developed as fully as possible. I believe this legislation could go a long way toward showing us whether such a dream can become a reality.

"The American system of schooling has gone through three great periods of development. The first saw the development of our national education system. The second era, in the late fifties and early sixties, was characterized by demands from certain disenfranchised groups for equal access to that system. Finally, three or four years ago, people began to feel that equal access wasn't enough, they wanted equal quality--'My child deserves as good an education as my neighbor's child; no matter what the handicap, no matter what the learning disability, no matter his race or socio-economic status, my child deserves the best education possible.' I'm convinced we can begin to meet

these demands, these rising 'educational expectations.' Our educational system has an enormous capacity to deal with a great range of educational needs, but we have to find the resources and personnel to work with all children. This legislation at least says, 'We're finally going to try to equalize opportunity and quality for everyone.'"

Teacher Centers

"If I were asked to summarize what a teacher center should be, I would say it should be a place or mechanism dedicated to helping teachers improve classroom instruction. It should be located as close as possible to the classrooms of teachers served and should relate as much as possible to current classroom problems or needs. Heavy emphasis should be given to sharing successes--especially of other teachers--and on marshalling resources to help deal with important needs. I also feel strongly that teacher centers need to relate to both individual needs and system needs; we often get hung up arguing for one or the other.

"A great deal of excitement and a slew of important questions have been sparked by the new teacher center legislation. Who will be in charge? Will a proliferation of center programs diminish higher education's role in inservice teacher education? How will supervisors be affected? What new roles might emerge for teachers? What are the implications for active research? Although the questions need asking, and most of them raise issues that need to be faced, they have too often been asked with a tone of hostility. What we most need is to find ways to work together to give this concept every chance to succeed. Teacher centers could, for example, strengthen higher education's role in teacher education by helping IHEs to deal more directly with high priority, current instructional issues and problems--with more thorough analysis of what happens in the classroom. There is a growing need for educators who have skills in which teachers are generally not expert--such as theory, analysis, research, development, diffusion and dissemination. Many teachers are, of course, highly proficient in one or more of these areas, but the specialties are not traditionally developed by those in the classroom. Also, if more inservice training takes place in or near the schools where teachers teach, more teachers are going to participate: more training programs using higher education personnel should result, not less. It is true, however, that more and more teachers, often in partnership with personnel from higher education, are going to become more involved as trainers, as researchers, as developers, as marketers."

Relationship Between Special Education and Teacher Centers

"If there is going to be a need for hundreds of thousands of new special educators in the years ahead, then those of several hundred thousand unemployed teachers in the country who have an interest in this rapidly growing new specialty should be retrained for these positions. There would be many advantages to such an approach: they could be retrained quickly, and have a broader educational base than new recruits, and their return to the classroom could significantly reduce unemployment. In reading state draft plans for staff development in special education, however, I have been disturbed by several common characteristics. There is a lot of talk about triple T's training double T's who will train single T's; a lot of talk about short workshops and

seminars, plans for reviving the outside-in wall-to-wall curriculum packages of the sixties. These plans seem to fly in the face of much that we've learned about staff development in the past decade. Real change in the classroom has to involve teachers, be carefully and thoroughly developed in partnership with them--and probably take place over a long period of time."

Proposed Teacher Center Regulations

The speaker described the proposed federal teacher center rules being published by the U.S. Office of Education for public reaction before the final regulations are completed. Dr. Schmieder differentiated between those elements of the regulations which are from the supporting law and cannot be altered by public feedback, and those which represent policy decisions by USOE and can be changed in the final regulations. As an example of the first type, he cited the section of the law which requires that 90 percent of the money must go to local education agencies; an example of the second is the requirement that policy boards be formed before proposal development.

The law, he said, is generally--and fortunately--relatively nonprescriptive and nonregulatory; it essentially authorizes grants to local education agencies and institutions of higher education to establish teacher centers with two broad functions--training and curriculum development--and allows a center to qualify by doing either or both. He noted that the requirement for a policy board--with a set formula of at least 51 percent teachers, including one each from special education and vocational education, at least one representative from higher education, and two representatives selected by the school board--has caused controversy. He related, however, that the majority-teacher requirement was no accident; a study of the long-term development negotiations (nearly two years) clearly shows that the main intent of Congress in passing the law was to give teachers more control over their own professional development.

Dr. Schmieder said proposals for teacher centers will be sent first to state education agencies, which will have the authority to reject them or to forward them to USOE. USOE will eventually select and monitor the projects, and is proposing that money for SEA technical assistance and dissemination services be set aside and allotted to each state according to the percentage of the total national program money received by that state for teacher center projects.

The speaker invited questions from the audience:

When will the money be available?

We can't spend money, no matter what the legal authority, until we get a final appropriation, and we expect that will not occur until the fall. Although authorization for the teacher centers and the retraining of higher education faculty was set at $75 million, the Administration requested only $5 million, for teacher centers and none for higher education retraining. The Senate has proposed $12.5 million for centers, and the House is holding at $5 million, so the two will need to get together and work out a compromise (a compromise has been recommended at $8.25 million). The final regulations will contain proce-

dures and dates for proposal submissions to SEAs and USOE. I would hope USOE could announce selection of projects to Congress by March 1978. Our concern is that centers can be started before potential staffers have to make 1978-79 contract decisions.

Will there be a particular format for the proposal?

The proposed regulations give considerable insight into the kind of proposal we will eventually expect. For example, the regulations will include criteria to be used in evaluating the proposals: What is the integrity of the proposal? Does it make sense? Does the staff seem to be the right kind of staff? Do they have the right kind of facility? What is the integrity of the policy board? Is it really representative of its constituency? Our proposal that the policy board be set up prior to development of the application has proved controversial, because it is felt that will be expensive and time consuming, especially in rural areas; but we feel that the policy board should be involved throughout the process if the center is to have credibility with teachers.

How will you handle evaluation as the program continues?

Educators everywhere dislike any talk of evaluation. I'm not sure how we are going to confront this highly important issue; but we are going to be asked constantly by Congress and dozens of other critic groups, "Is the program working?" We are going to try to avoid linking the success of teacher centers to student achievement--at least in the beginning--because we want to give project developers time to work with the concept. However, I believe other measures of success can be used; for example, more training is taking place closer to the site; more training is relating to immediate classroom problems; more training is based on validated products.

What has been/will be the experience with parents on the representational policy board?

This is a new governance structure, so we will have to wait and see. People on the policy board, regardless of whom they represent, could probably use some orientation, some training, as to how such boards operate. In the beginning there could even be some hostility, game playing, position establishing. You may also be getting at the point that, even though it has "control," the policy board does not have legal authority over the program, so it would be possible for an institution of higher education or a school board to go against decisions made by the policy board. However, it has been my program experience that this rarely happens.

If the teacher center policy board does not have legal control, who does?

Whoever "holds" the contract--the local education agency, the institution of higher education--ultimately the boards or trustees at these institutions. It is expected that LEAs and IHEs will delegate considerable authority over center operations to policy boards, but I doubt any agency will give up its ultimate authority.

Do you anticipate the policy board might make decisions outside the original objectives?

That could violate the proposal and plan of operation--which become part of the legal foundation for a project. If the proposal says a center will serve elementary teachers only and is funded on that basis, and the policy board then decides it will deal with community college or high school personnel, there would be a contractual or legal problem. I hope, however, that the board will be given considerable flexibility, so that centers can be responsive to changing needs.

How will the regulations ensure that the policy board is representative?

As it is now proposed, if a bargaining agent exists, it will pick the teacher members. If no such organization exists, other alternatives are given. The regulations don't specify how to pick the other representatives.

If such a bargaining agreement exists, but it does not represent the majority of the teachers to be served, do we still have to go to it to set up the policy board?

My inclination is to say yes; if there is a bargaining agent recognized by the LEA, it will pick the teacher representatives. I don't believe the regulations say anything about the agent representing the majority. If there is no bargaining agent, then the regulations do talk about representing the majority.

What consideration is given to teachers not within an LEA--in a state school, for example?

Once a proposal defines a service area and specifies the kind of teachers (by level or subject, for example) to be served, all the teachers in that area who meet the level or subject requirements must be served, whether they teach in public or in private institutions.

What is the rationale for the proposal not to fund substitutes?

A very important factor in this decision was the expected low appropriation. If we only receive $5 million, it might be more important to test the concept, in a variety of different ways and in a number of different places, than to support substitutes. If we had $50 million, the situation would be different; we could test the concept and underwrite released time for the teachers. We understand the crucial importance of training during regular hours, but we estimate that if we supported substitutes, we would have approximately half as many centers as we could support if we did not. We would like to find ways through bargaining and tradeoffs to persuade LEAs to provide some or all of that time. People have reacted strongly and generally recommend that policy boards should have the choice regarding support of released time. If I read the early reaction right, it is probable that this will be one of the first proposed rules to be changed.

How do we get long-term involvement and clinical support into the schools, and how are we going to pay for it?

Under this law, teacher centers will essentially do what the policy board wants. If the policy board can be convinced that certain kinds of programs are desirable, they can probably be developed. But the fundamental purpose of the

center program will be to help regular classroom teachers. Whether or not the center can help we need to find resources to work with these other groups--student teachers, administrators, supervisors. I believe resources for education are increasing, not diminishing, but educators just are not very good at fighting for their piece of the money pie.

How compatible do you think teacher centers and special education are?

I think they have a great deal to offer each other, and I have already emphasized that in many of my previous remarks. But there are a number of issues that seem to be emerging that need careful consideration:

Kinds of Proposed Training Seem Out of Step. Many of the special education inservice programs for teachers outlined in several dozen state and university plans that I have read over the past months propose a broad range of short-term seminars and institutes. An abundance of evidence in studies of such programs says that they represent one of the least effective approaches to inservice education. Several notable evaluations even showed a negative correlation between this type of instruction and improvement in the classroom. Special education models or strategies studied seem to reflect a top-down/outside-in approach, whereas teacher centers focus on an inside-out approach--one where needs are identified, then resources are brought in to help meet the needs.

System/Group-wide Treatments. Although teacher centers can and will often develop training programs for helping classroom personnel to better meet high priority problems of schools and local education agencies, they are most concerned with helping individual teachers to cope with their unique instructional and professional development needs.

Inservice-Preservice Linkages. The handicapped legislation requires close cooperation between inservice and preservice teacher training programs. Most teacher centers do not; the teacher center bill does not. We do, of course, hope that such linkages will be developed.

Possible "Turf" Problems. Most specialties have operated in isolation from the regular classroom teacher. There has been a "hardening of categories" over the past several years. It is likely that special educators will be reticent to collaborate on an equal basis with "regular" classroom teachers, and the regular teachers will be reticent to have "one more expert" tell them how to do things.

Program Focus. The handicapped law puts heavy emphasis on dealing directly with the needs of students, while teacher centers and most staff development programs of the past decade have focused directly on the needs of teachers--which are often different from those of their students.

Special Education and Staff Development. Almost everyone agrees that new curricula and classroom approaches cannot be effectively implemented without substantial staff development. An examination of many of the new comprehensive plans for educating all handicapped children shows a relatively small percentage of resources directed toward this need.

DR. JASPER HARVEY: "Education for the Handicapped Regulations"

Dr. Harvey distributed copies of the just completed, corrected draft for proposed regulations relating to a "Comprehensive System of Personnel Development" for PL 94-142. He noted that, while the regulations were not written by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Division of Personnel Preparation, DPP had been consulting in their development for at least a year, and the regulations articulate with DPP's training process. He drew attention to various aspects of the regulations, and gave a rationale for their inclusion.

Personnel preparation, he said, is critical to the program. The states have estimated an additional 308,602 teachers will be needed to comply completely with the Act by September 1, 1978. That estimate--drawn from reports to the Division of Assistance to States, which has responsibility for PL 94-142--is based on a needs assessment indicating 2,840,000 children in the 6- to 19-year age group were unserved during the 1975-76 school year. Roughly 737,000 children in the 0- to 5-year age group also were not receiving training.

However, Dr. Harvey said, no breakdown is available on how many of the nearly three million unserved students are mildly handicapped youngsters who would be mainstreamed during part of the day; teachers to serve those youngsters would be regular classroom teachers who must upgrade or acquire skills in dealing with the students in their least restrictive environment. And while it is also known that inservice education was provided to 175,000 teachers, again there is no indication of how much of that was in one-shot "awareness" workshops and how much in extended inservice experiences.

Whether the teachers are new or retrained personnel, those students need to be served, the speaker said, and anyone who will be working in supportive roles should be receiving appropriate inservice education. "Cooperative planning is required to ensure (a) the availability of leadership personnel to bring service to low incidence and severely handicapped groups, and (b) dissemination of procedures for preservice and inservice special education personnel, as well as for regular educators and administrators."

He noted that DPP has been channeling money into the priority of training regular educators since 1974, and continued, "We are looking at quality as well as quantity. The planning has allowed state and other concerned agencies to make some very careful personnel needs assessments, and a needs assessment is required for the annual plan to be developed for each state to receive money. We are working with all people training to meet those needs; qualified personnel can be developed at both inservice and preservice levels.

"Attempts have been made to include participation by other agencies and institutions so that everyone concerned with teacher education for exceptional children can have input--parents, advocacy organizations, etc. People are becoming much more verbal and articulate about being excluded from the decision making. The key word here is cooperation: input begets responsibility!

"It will be the responsibility of the school, through the whole assessment process and the writing of an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), to say

what kind of services each student needs and who should be providing those services. Appropriate assessment of youngsters will be an extremely critical factor, and the state's comprehensive plan will specify who needs to be concerned. Problems will arise as the IEP describes medical-related services needed by the youngster. These services probably will not be provided by the state through educational funds; other agencies will be providing them. But in order for the youngster to be receiving appropriate supportive and educational services, such related needs must be met as well."

A question was raised from the audience: If medical assistance is not the responsibility of just one agency, to whom does a parent go when three agencies are cooperating on one plan? Dr. Harvey's answer: "This is a matter of coordinating the various agencies which will be providing the services the students need. Most of the students we are talking about will not be in their least restrictive environment in a regular classroom; they will be in a self-contained situation. The evaluation process indicates a particular child needs certain services to progress to an optimum level of functioning. Then a decision needs to be made: are those services available? This does not absolve the assessment process from identifying what those needs are, but the responsibility of the school is that if those services are available, there should be released time or whatever is necessary for the child to receive those services. It might be the parents' responsibility to transport the child to the services; sometimes the agencies will take that responsibility. The ideal is relative to where you are."

Dr. Harvey said the Individualized Education Plan is not intended to be a minute-by-minute description of what an individual should do; it is a broad-based description of objectives. Nor is the IEP a legal document; it cannot be taken to court as a contract where a teacher does not fulfill all the objectives stated.

Inservice personnel development programs are to be based on the statewide assessed needs for implementing the Act, he said. Specific regulatory language enables state education agencies, with 25 percent of "flow through" program money after the first year, to contract out to other agencies for inservice training. The regulations state: "The state educational agency may enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies, and other agencies, institutions, or organizations (which may include parent, handicapped, or other advocacy organizations), to carry out: (1) experimental or innovative personnel development programs, (2) development or modification of instructional materials, and (3) dissemination of significant information derived from educational research and demonstrations." The speaker envisioned that teacher centers could play a significant role.

The inservice training should be needs-based, conducted over time, evaluated, and recycled; one-shot workshops are not sufficient, Dr. Harvey said. Regulations identifying areas where training is needed "are addressing the knowledge and skills needed to teach children with a specific disability in a specific subject area, knowledge and skills for (a) systematic teaching from an IEP; (b) decisions about assessment procedures, skills, roles, objectives, and materials; and (c) effective communication and cooperative planning with others--professionals, parents, students."

He said the annual SEA plan must include procedures for evaluating the overall effectiveness of the state's comprehensive system of personnel development, and procedures for administering the system. A description of monitoring activities to assure implementation of the personnel development system also is required.

ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, NEEDS, ISSUES, RECOMMENDATIONS (Small Group Discussions)

Participants convened in small groups for discussion of specified questions and topics:

--Who is responsible for staff development in special education? Organizations: institutions of higher education? state education agencies? local education agencies? Roles: principals? central office personnel? special education supervisors? teachers? parents?

--Who should be trained? In what priority order if resources are limited?

--What should be the training emphasis?

--Who are the trainers?

--What about Parent Involvement Training?

--How much training is necessary for (a) orientation/"awareness" and (b) skill building?

--What about teacher certification?

--Where are the resources: (a) fiscal, (b) materials and programs, (c) human resources?

--What are the implications for preservice?

Group facilitators coordinated this activity, and a recorder from each group reported the discussions to the entire conference audience.

GROUP A

(Reported by Judy DiMeo of Rhode Island)

Teacher center designs were a major focus for discussion in this group. It was noted that training needs vary depending on teachers' sites. Priorities listed were (a) awareness and (b) retraining of special education personnel. The group also discussed types of inservice education that might be most effective. It was felt that definition of terms is critical so that all

involved are able to communicate with each other; a glossary is definitely needed.

GROUP B
(Reported by Charles Achilles of Tennessee)

Responsibility for staff development in special education should be a cooperative arrangement among higher education institutions, local education agencies, and state agencies. Publicly, LEAs need to take the lead in order to ensure success. Although states will differ in ways of operation, the comprehensive staff development plan should reflect closely the needs of its clients--teachers, building administrators, district administrators, etc. Local communities may need assistance in the awareness process; in that case, the state dissemination unit should take the lead in this function. Operating from the LEA level may pose problems of incorporating information into the state plan.

A concern was expressed over problems in certification. Does this Act enter the area of requiring separate certification or endorsement of currently practicing teachers in order to meet the requirements of working with handicapped youngsters? Different teaching styles require different training. Other models with implications were cited: the Right To Read model of developing high-quality state standards in needs assessments at the local level; the use of Title IV/IX (the General Assistance Centers), a good part of PL 94-142. The group compared this Act to the Civil Rights legislation in import.

GROUP C
(Reported by Raymond Hopper of Ohio)

The group expressed concern about co-mingling of funds, and wondered whether the teacher center will be one of the agencies that might pick up where other centers in special education are leaving off. In funding inservice education for teachers, preference should be given to places where teacher centers are currently in operation. A prime interest in inservice education should be the attitude of regular classroom teachers who receive handicapped students into their classrooms. Other critical target groups for inservice are superintendents and principals. The group recommended released time for local inservice and college courses, and saw problems if additional requirements for teacher certification were to be mandated.

GROUP D
(Reported by Joan Dvorak of Illinois)

This group discussed funding: who needs to train whom, to do what, and with what money? Special education money used for teacher centers would be limited to certain districts. What kind of impetus is behind the legislation, and how long will it be there? Will the local education agencies eventually have to fund teacher centers? In what areas are funds being duplicated for special education and teacher centers; how can this be avoided? What kinds of funds are available for special education through vocational education programs? What is the startup time for funding a piece of legislation?

Other issues considered were: Where does the power lie to make decisions, appoint members, and decide terms of office? What is the relationship of teacher centers to college courses? (Response: the teacher center meets the defined needs of the local education agency; courses are simply transferred.) System needs vs. individual needs--it was felt that to change the system for the individual or the system, it is necessary to work with the individual.

GROUP E
(Reported by Anne Connelly of Massachusetts)

Staff development in special education was seen as a shared responsibility for money, time, and resources. Administrators, superintendents, school committee members, and principals should all be trained: peer trainers should be used. An initial awareness seminar might be given by outside trainers: but for the "nitty gritty" of dealing with the problems, peer trainers are preferred. Emphasis in training should be on needs assessment, and on teacher center models for provision of services. Among criteria for effective training, information sharing was seen as an important aspect. Priorities in who should receive inservice training were discussed, and it was felt that if the training does not begin at the teacher level, difficulties may result in the mainstreaming process. Teacher centers were described as powerful because they can deal with teachers.

The five group reports were summarized as lists of general recommendations and questions for further consideration:

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Define terms related to process and content.
2. Priorities are: (a) awareness for all involved, and (b) retraining of special education personnel.
3. Share the responsibilities of staff development in special education among higher education, state agencies, local districts, and teacher organizations.
4. Start training with the classroom teacher.
5. Train all professional staff and policy makers.
6. Establish training which is highly responsive to identified needs. LEAs should take the leadership role in training, yet LEA plans must interface with SEA plans.
7. Devise mechanism for dissemination of research, products, practices, and other information.
8. Utilize peer trainers--teachers training teachers, administrators training administrators.
9. Deal with attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward working with the handicapped child.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

1. What kind of impetus is behind both Teacher Center and Special Education legislation? How long will it survive?
2. Is there an overlap or duplication between PL 94-142 and Teacher Center funds? When will these funds be available?

3. Certification--must currently certified teachers be recertified to work with the handicapped?
4. What are the specific training areas? What is the source of funding?
5. What is most effective type of inservice training?
6. What are the various teacher center designs?
7. Where is decision-making power in teacher center boards?
8. Are Vocational Education funds available to support Special Education activities?

RESPONSE AND DIALOG
(Issues Generated by Small Group Discussion)

The lists of recommendations and concerns generated by the small group discussions were distributed to particpants Tuesday morning, and a panel responded to those issues. Panel members were Patti Bourexis (moderator), Bruce Balow, Allen Schmieder, Charles Harrington (Coordinator of Special Education, Rhode Island Department of Education), and Ronald DiOrio (President of the National Education Association/Rhode Island). Each panelist made a presentation, and the panel fielded questions from participants.

CHARLES HARRINGTON

Awareness about Public Law 94-142 and training: "What I am concerned about is the amount of misinformation which is generated. Training should start at the classroom level, but a certain level of training, at least in awareness, should be in school boards and city and town councils, because of the funding aspects of PL 94-142."

Certification: "The question is whether currently certified teachers need to be recertified to work with the handicapped. Personally, I don't feel we need to say everyone who will be affected by placement in the least restrictive environment needs to be totally recertified as a special education teacher, but that's one of the areas with which we are struggling."

Responsibility: "Who is going to initiate training? The suggestion is that it should be shared by SEAs, LEAs, and the IHEs; however, the ultimate responsibility in staff development in inservice rests with the SEA to see the requirements are carried out."

RONALD DiORIO

"The problem will not be regulations, but what is laid on at the local level in the name of regulations."

Negotiations: "I don't believe there will be a statewide or national program to bring certain issues, as they relate to PL 94-142, to the bargaining table; but I do believe those issues will be there and they will be issues that pertain to the particular school system. At the state and national level, we will be talking about the kinds of inservice education that will take place, and about planning time and compensation for development of IEPs. These issues will

be on the table. Many other concerns will be raised at the local level, but if competent, capable, reasonable administrators are implementing the regulations, the concerns will be far less severe."

Certification: "In any inservice program, states should not mandate that every teacher take three credits or ten credits in identifying learning disabilities. Some teachers will require more, some less, inservice training, but that is a determination the teacher needs to make."

The relationship between education and media: "The media don't understand education or our terminolcgy. A major problem in implementing regulations will be in assuming that the media and the public understand our educational jargon."

BRUCE BALOW

"The movement for handicapped children is the last vestige of a movement for civil rights and human rights for all people. Movements for the poor, the GI Bill of Rights, Blacks, criminal rights, the women's movement have been a series of steps for the inclusion of all people in this country, and handicapped children need to be included. This is relevant to the question of whether to mandate or just encourage through education: most of the social changes which have occurred in this country have been mandated."

ALLEN SCHMIEDER

"One of the biggest issues in teacher centering--and in the area of its relationship to special education--is whether centers concentrate on unique needs of individuals or on problems that are seen as system-wide priorities. The best answer is 'both.' We need to find some way of focusing on critical issues such as special education. People say we can't predict what will occur in those centers, but I disagree. I have found that large numbers of existing centers work on the same problems and deal with them in similar ways. There must be effective ways to share knowledge about special education--or consumer education--without saying, 'Rhode Island is doing it this way, someone else is doing it another way.' There should be some awareness that people are dealing with the same problems, rather than continue to say, 'We're going to do it our own way.'

"Are vocational education funds available to support special education activities? At the federal level there is an estimated $20 billion available for staff development of one kind or another, and the teacher center program may have only $4 to $6 million. You should begin to look for support from other sources--some quite strange on first examination. A publication available from ERIC, Staffing the Learning Society,[1] by the President's Advisory Committee on Educational Professions Development, was the first systematic

---

1 Staffing the Learning Society: Recommendations for Federal Legislation. A Report to the President and the Congress. March 1975. ED 102 161. Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210.

attempt to locate these staff development funds. Teacher center personnel who don't know much about special education may write to the University of Miami Center for Training and Technical Assistance (P.O. Box 248074, Coral Gables, FL 33124) and ask for past newsletters. You may also write to the Council for Exceptional Children (1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091) for information about a new journal, Teacher Education and Special Education, which is slated to begin publication this summer. ERIC has a bibliography on teacher centers,[2] and others on special education.[3] You should all know the federal government's policies; but you also need to study state guidelines and policies, because state plans differ from state to state. It will also be important to be on top of what your school system and local teacher organization think about the subject.

"How do we deal with needs once they are identified? What is the most effective form of inservice training? We should think of the teacher center not only as a place concerned about teachers and their immediate problems, but as a place where we marshal resources and look at questions and problems more systematically than has usually been the case in inservice education. Regarding effectiveness, you might look at the results of studies done by USOE and NIE for Follow-Through and other major training programs of recent years. Because there has been some common ground for these studies, their results may have considerable potential for replicability."

PATTI BOUREXIS

"In discussing financial and human resources which will be available, we are focusing on the local and federal level and missing two levels of administration and organization that come in between--the state and regional education agencies. Even though money is coming from the federal government, it is reasonable to say this money is not sufficient to establish a financial base for delivering the staff development which will be necessary.

"Cultivate what funding and support and resources are available to you from your state, and don't forget regional education agencies as sources of funding, collaboration, and coordination. Find out what curriculum development material exists at hand so that as you look at staff development for special education and these new pieces of legislation, you don't have to 'reinvent the wheel.' Look to see what's available and what you can internalize in your own particular area. Contact the National Association of State

---

2 Mary F. Crum, Ed. Teacher Centers, March 1977. Bibliographies on Educational Topics, No. 6. Available from ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Suite 616, 1 Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036; $1.10. ED 134 556.

3 A recent example: Jenni Klein. Teaching the Special Child in Regular Classrooms. With ERIC Abstract Bibliography. February 1977. Available from ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, University of Illinois, 805 West Pennsylvania Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801. Catalog #158; $2.75. Other pertinent bibliographies can be obtained through a search of the ERIC data file, Resources in Education.

Directors of Special Education (1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036), which has prepared explanatory packages on PL 94-142."

BRUCE BALOW

"We should not be dogmatic about what we do here. The problem is consciousness or awareness that handicapped children, with all kinds of attributes and characteristics, can learn. Teachers are fearful about how to deal with them, and have a need for knowledge and skill about how to teach them. Teacher centers can have a very strong role to play in staff development. Administrators' and teachers' roles call for different ways of solving problems and attention to different areas.

"We have an unlimited number of local needs, and staff development has to respond to all of these needs. There is also a question of what special educators need to learn and what regular educators need to learn. We all have very distinct staff development needs. The most effective staff development will vary enormously from one circumstance to the next. Staff development for educating the handicapped is as complex as any in teacher education."

(QUESTION-ANSWER)

SCHMIEDER: How do you please people who say, on the one hand, "Don't mandate, don't require," and then turn around and insist that all teachers must understand multicultural education or how to teach reading? It's easy to say everyone should teach in their own way, at their own pace, but if the public is concerned about certain common classroom problems, how should we respond?

DiORIO: If the objective is to change attitudes, it would be a mistake to mandate certification requirements. Other mechanisms have been developed in our teacher centers. Offering college and university credits for inservice education during the day, on site, we found teachers were taking part in the inservice programs. They were staying after school. In the first cycle of training, 1400 people out of 10,000 signed up.

DAMBRUCH: Will teacher centers be eligible to apply to receive funds from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Title VI, etc.?

SCHMIEDER: You would have to check that out with BEH, but I would think that centers would have to apply as part of an LEA package.

AUDIENCE: Will you talk about the co-mingling of funds, particularly the question of teacher centers applying for funds for support under PL 94-142?

SCHMIEDER: Co-mingling, as generally defined, requires that two programs work together, and program administrators are hesitant to do that. Some special education personnel are very cautious about teacher centers and other related staff development approaches because they're concerned that their money will be coopted or controlled by other interest groups. Cooperation between the two groups is very desirable, and I think that teacher center personnel could have a lot of leverage if they approach special education leaders and work with them from the beginning.

JOHN FAVORS (Director, Bay Area Learning Center, Oakland, Calif.): You need to take the relationship between the teacher center and the LEA into consideration. You can have problems with the recognized leaders of special

education in the district when you go to the SEA for funds. You should have a sound base before you move.

BALOW: In practical terms, each year there is competition for training money which goes to the Office of Education. Eligible parties to compete include SEAs and IHEs; nonprofit organizations may also apply to the special projects branch. Any time an agency has money, it gets protective. If you represent an agency which has not in the past been a major participant, you should expect some resistance; but you will get a fair hearing if you persist, because the need is great.

BOUREXIS: Local special education directors will be faced with the task of implementing PL 94-142, and they may say they're not responsible for staff development and don't want to be. If ever there was a time local special education personnel will want a staff development specialist around, it is now.

SCHMIEDER: The U.S. Comptroller General has developed a report to the President that characterizes this piece of legislation as essentially dependent on a foundation of staff development. There are very strong recommendations to the President that staff development have first priority.

JOE GILMORE (Albany, New York): Teacher centers should find out who is the operative person at the state level. Also, as a resource, I recommend an attitudes curriculum developed by Shirley Cohen at Hunter College and published by Developmental Learning Materials. The materials are for children K-3 and approach knowledge and attitudes in a variety of ways.

Can you clarify a signal from our lawyers, that we can'touch Title VI-B money for training until all priorities are met?

AUDIENCE: We've used Title VI-B money for staff development when we have: (a) identified priorities; (b) had a program going; and (c) identified the teacher and said, "This is a need of that teacher." We have been refused when we were not specific.

TED BECK (Lansing, Michigan): In Michigan we were told the Priority B money is to be used for all students who are unserved or inadequately served. If you can prove that money is needed to train teachers to reach these students, then you may use B money as part of the rationale for Priority 2.

SCHMIEDER: If all the monies projected for special education become available, so that you can begin to talk about the 12 to 15 percent of the youngsters who have learning disabilities, you will ultimately have to deal in one way or another with all students. To deal effectively with the 12 to 15 percent with the greatest learning disabilities, I believe we will have to reform most of what happens in the classroom--maybe in such a way that we stop talking about children with learning disabilities and finally deal with the reality that all of us are different and have disabilities of one kind or another.

RHODE ISLAND TEACHER CENTER MODEL

To illustrate one way in which teacher centers may serve in implementation of special education staff development, the Rhode Island Teacher Center model was described in detail. Presenters were Dr. Edward L. Dambruch, Director of the Rhode Island Teacher Center; Ms. Mary Costello, Consultant in Special Education, Rhode Island Department of Education; and Ms. Judy DiMeo, Coordinator, Staff Development Project, Rhode Island College.

EDWARD DAMBRUCH

Dr. Dambruch described the functions of the Rhode Island Teacher Center in delivering staff development programs for special education.

"The Rhode Island Teacher Center was first funded with planning money in 1971. Funds went to a higher education institution, the University of Rhode Island. We operate fiscally through the university, the staff of the project is located at the State Department of Education, and we work closely with the second state IHE, Rhode Island College, in our training activities. We operate out of a state agency and serve all 40 LEAs.

"We have an advisory board consisting of representatives from IHEs, the principals organization, both professional teachers organizations, community members, and representatives of the superintendents. The board serves only in an advisory capacity.

"We are not a center where people can come in to see us; we developed a process which is made available to our clients in the local school districts. One of the strengths of locating in a state agency is that we have the resources of that environment to strengthen our process.

"The RITC model has five stages:

1. We first conducted needs assessment activities. We ascertained the perceived needs of teachers. We did not attempt to validate those perceptions.
2. We found validated programs. We searched out programs which would assist in establishing local training programs to meet the identified needs.
3. We talked with the IHE about what kind of training activities we would offer with their assistance, and negotiated credits and fees (we pay all fees). We also asked the IHE to identify trainers within the institution who could become our trainers in the field, to train other trainers.
4. We called an awareness conference, to which each school district could send eight representatives. Developers of materials and programs attended to answer questions; they also met with the higher education trainers, who later followed up the conference with the representative teams, leaders, and teachers in local districts. Also, districts were not required to submit an elaborate proposal to obtain needed training. We were able at the conference to give an idea of incentives available. For example, one incentive was released time. We asked the Board of Regents to release students and allow teachers time for inservice education. Now twenty half-days per year are available for inservice released time.
5. After the awareness conference, training began on site, in the schools. We try to measure the effectiveness of the training through teachers' perceptions. After the materials are in the school for six months, we return to ask about the impact training has had on day-to-day activities in the classroom.

"Every district has participated, and we train 1500 teachers a year."

(QUESTION-ANSWER)

AUDIENCE: Is the teacher center the main thrust for delivering inservice education in the state at this time?

DAMBRUCH: Yes, in the state agency, we have taken monies from various sources and run a number of programs, such as the Right To Read program.

AUDIENCE: What about training for vocational education, bilingual education, and compensatory education? Is that kind of inservice training going on in the state?

DAMBRUCH: Yes; we still do not manage the staff development monies for their programs, but we're trying.

AUDIENCE: Is someone coordinating that?

DAMBRUCH: Most of the vocational education, compensatory education, and other inservice training is given to the LEAs in a larger grant: the LEA will get a vocational education grant to establish a career education program, and part of that would be for inservice education. They don't have training activities specifically from the state agency; they deal directly with IHEs for training.

AUDIENCE: You have a lot of inservice training going on in a lot of different agencies in the state. How do you know there is not a lot of overlap?

DAMBRUCH: We do know there is overlap; we hope there isn't a lot. We really have to inventory the agencies to find out what is going on in staff development.

AUDIENCE: Why did you put your money in a university (URI)?

DAMBRUCH: The program was as an amendment to an existing EPDA grant, and the university was the only place with an existing EPDA grant.

MARY COSTELLO

As consultant in special education at the Rhode Island Department of Education, Ms. Costello detailed DOE's participation.

"In the past, Title VI-D monies in special education were used for summer traineeships in priority areas and special study institutes during the school year for administrators, principals, and teachers. A decision was made last fall to use Title VI-D money in a different manner. We adopted the process that had been developed by the RITC and provided on-site inservice training in special education.

"We organized a special education staff development advisory board consisting of representatives from the professional teacher associations, IHEs, principals association, superintendents association, and parents. The first activity was an orientation session for LEAs on the implementation of federal and state regulations.

"A needs assessment and a review of federal and state mandates established five priority needs:

1. Teacher training program for elementary teachers working with the handicapped
2. Teacher training program for secondary teachers working with the handicapped
3. Special Education Advisors program for development, organization, and operation of an advisory committee
4. Principals training program
5. Program training teachers in development and implementation of IEPs.

"We reviewed programs and products in those priority areas: we identified an elementary teacher training program and a principals training program from the Texas Education Agency. We reviewed the manual, Functions of the Placement Committee in Special Education, developed by the National Association of State Directors for Special Education, and decided to use it as a guide in the development of the IEP inservice program. We met with the staff of Rhode Island College, who took these programs and/or products and adapted and modified them to fit the needs of Rhode Island administrators and teachers. The College agreed to develop a program for training special education advisory committee members.

"With the exception of the principals program and the Functions of the Placement Committee in Special Education program, a three-phase plan was developed for all programs:

Phase I Orientation/awareness training
Phase II Skill building
Phase III Implementation

"The Elementary Teachers Training Program, for example, consisted of:

		Hours	Credit
Phase I	Mainstreaming Mildly Handicapped in Regular Education	16	1
Phase II	Skill building	32	3
Phase III	Implementation	24	2

"The Principals Training Program is a one-phase program, and the Functions of the Placement Committee program is a four-phase program.

"LEAs were asked to submit proposals for on-site inservice education, and to submit names of teachers who were interested in participating, to ensure that teachers were aware of program content. We also encourage school systems to apply for all phases when submitting proposals. To be eligible for Phase II, applicants must have participated in Phase I.

"At an awareness conference for the five inservice programs, developers demonstrated programs and answered questions. After Rhode Island College has trained the field trainers and provided them with materials, on-site inservice education began. We are just completing Phase I, and hope to run the Phase II programs in the summer and fall.

"Rhode Island College and the State Department of Education cooperated in monitoring and evaluating the program. We monitored one full session of each

of the training programs; an evaluation form also is administered to participants after they have completed the program. These evaluations provide us with data to make adjustments or changes. We also bring together the trainers and the college and state staff members in a debriefing session to discuss problems, concerns, and recommended changes."

(QUESTION-ANSWER)

AUDIENCE: By credits, do you mean graduate credits or certificate renewal credits?

COSTELLO: We are talking about graduate credits, not necessarily program credits. We ask individuals to meet with their advisors to decide whether that credit can apply to their programs.

AUDIENCE: Who were the respondents to the needs assessment survey?

COSTELLO: A team of eight individuals from each of the school systems were asked to respond as individuals: regular classroom teacher, special classroom teacher, parent, central administrative personnel, elementary principal, secondary principal, and support personnel.

JUDY DiMEO

The higher education institution's role was explained by Ms. DiMeo, Rhode Island College's coordinator for the staff development project. She listed ten activities in which the college cooperated:

1. Identification of the needed training program
2. Selection of college faculty coordinators
3. Adaptation or development of Phase I programs
4. Selection of trainers
5. Scheduling of sites and trainers
6. Training of trainers
7. Monitoring by SEA/IHE
8. Evaluation by participants
9. Debriefing session with trainers
10. Revision of training programs as required.

"The IHE was involved in each of these activities. College coordinators were self-selected, based on their interest and expertise in staff development for special education. Phase I programs were developed or adapted to meet Rhode Island needs; they are highly specific in structure, but vary in format of instructional modes.

"The college coordinators selected trainers, who were seen as key elements and were encouraged to use their peers as trainers. The coordinators interacted with an LEA contact person to identify the site for training; teachers in the community participated in selecting an appropriate time for the inservice activities. The coordinator took the trainers through the steps involved in the various instructional activities; the training covered scope, sequence, content, and materials of training.

"Input from the monitoring, evaluation, and debriefing activities will be used to revise and improve the training programs."

(QUESTION-ANSWER)

AUDIENCE: Did the coordinator create the criteria for selection of trainers, or was there commonality as to qualifications of trainers?

DiMEO: The criteria were set; the program dictated the criteria.

AUDIENCE: Since the program was highly structured and highly centralized, did the issue of academic freedom and/or professional responsibility come up, at either the college faculty or trainer level?

DiMEO: We didn't find any such problems. The special education faculty worked well together, and there was a lot of feedback during development stage.

AUDIENCE: Was faculty on load?

DiMEO: No, this was extra load.

AUDIENCE: How were those chosen as trainers compensated?

DiMEO: They were paid by an established fee schedule for part-time faculty and staff.

AUDIENCE: In the evaluation process, do you have the commitment of the LEA to become knowledgeable and to use the knowledge they get in training, or do you leave that to the willingness of the LEA?

DiMEO: We don't ask for formal commitments because so often we are dealing with individual teachers, but we do ask for follow-through: "If we provide training for you teachers in this first phase, will you follow through with the skill building phase and the implementation phase?" But we did not ask for a written commitment to implement.

AUDIENCE: How many participants completed the first phase of training in respect to the number who began?

DiMEO: We've had a very low dropout rate. The trainers did take attendance each week. Involvement was built into the training process.

AUDIENCE: Do you have anything built into your evaluation process to show the impact on students?

DiMEO: No, we don't have impact data built into the evaluation at this time, but I see this for the future.

COLLABORATION FOR INSERVICE EDUCATION

Ms. Lana Pipes, Editor of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, interviewed Ms. Mary Costello about the collaborative roles of the state education department's Special Education unit, Rhode Island College, and the Rhode Island Teacher Center in the presentation of inservice education programs.

* * * * *

In the general session, you described to conference participants the process of using the teacher center mechanisms for delivering inservice education programs in special education to local school systems. Would you elaborate on the programs themselves?

All the programs, with the exception of the principals and the Functions of the Placement Committee in Special Education programs, consist of three phases: Phase I is awareness orientation, Phase II is actual skill development, and Phase III is on-site technical assistance to the individual program. The Principals Training Program is a one-phase program, and the Functions of the Placement Committee program has four phases. I think the best way to describe this is to talk about the Elementary Teachers Training Program. Phase I consists of 16 hours, one graduate credit, and teachers are introduced to federal legislation, state legislation, and characteristics of handicapped children. Phase II will be a three-credit course, 32 hours; the purpose of that course is training teachers to modify their curriculums to the learning styles of the handicapped children who will be in the regular classroom. Phase III would be on-site technical assistance in adapting a program to an individual child's needs.

Participants do get credit for attending the course?

Yes. Shortly after Rhode Island College agreed to develop the programs, we sat down with the College and established credits for each of them. The programs are essentially free of charge to the teachers, on-site, no stipends. Materials and instructors' fees are paid through Title VI-D funds.

By instructors, you mean the peer trainers that you identified? Do they get paid?

Yes, Title VI-D funds pay the instructors' salaries.

Did you turn down any of the proposals from local education agencies?

In this first phase, we were able to fund all the requests. Funding is competitive; however, we did have enough money for all the proposals. We were fortunate during the first cycle to receive some money from the Northeast Regional Resource System, largely due to the efforts of Judy DiMeo, our state resource consultant, who was able to secure some funds to supplement our Part VI-D funds.

How many people are involved?

We have 52 on-site inservice workshops in Phase I ongoing this semester. We're just beginning; the five programs have been operating only since January. About 1300 individuals requested training. We will get an exact report at the end of the training, around June 27. We expect there'll be approximately 1200 participants because of dropouts--people who for one reason or another, when the time was established, chose not to participate in the program.

Are the sessions actual classes, and when do they take place?

They are actual classes; when and where they are held depends on the LEA. Some of the local school systems have released time, so some of the inservice programs are taking place during the school day. The majority of the programs are after school--from 3 to 5 p.m. Some of the parent advisory training is 7 to 10 p.m.

What are the problems teachers want help with?

When teachers heard that PL 94-142 had been passed--actually, it's still proposed at this point in time, but the proposed regulations were there--some of their chief concerns were: "Next September are we going to get ten handicapped children in our classrooms? If that's so, what types of handicapped children? How many students in all are we going to have?" The teachers didn't have enough information; they needed basic information on the law and on the characteristics of the types of students they would be receiving. Some had misconceptions such as, "In September, is half my class going to be made up of handicapped children?" The emphasis in the awareness sessions of these programs was on information and changing teachers' attitudes by giving them the information they need. In effect: "No, they weren't going to receive severely handicapped children. Yes, they were going to receive some children who had individual learning styles, and there were some skills necessary to modify programs to meet the needs of these special children who will be in there." A real concern was numbers, that the least restrictive alternative, in effect, was going to do away with all the self-contained special classes, and all those children would be in the regular classroom. Principals wanted to know, "What types of organization can I become aware of and implement within my individual school?" A concern of both regular and special education teachers was, "What is an Individualized Education Plan? What are its essential components? Who are the principal individuals that should be involved on the team? Who decides who should be on the team, over and above that which is mandated in the federal regulations?" The individuals who will be making up the parent advisory training committees wanted information on the federal and state laws, and also on how they can function as an effective advisory council. We have state regulations mandating that all local school systems must have local advisory committees in special education in effect as of September 1, 1977, and the membership is also mandated. The concern of the LEAs was to have individuals who know how to function as an advisory committee, and the individuals appointed to advisory committees wanted information on how they could effectively function.

Will all those involved in the first phase be invited to choose whether they want to go on to Phase II?

We urge the local school systems to encourage their teachers to participate in all phases. We consider each of the programs with three phases a program. Some Phase II programs will be held this summer; the majority of them will be next fall. All individuals who participated in Phase I will be eligible to participate in Phase II.

What kinds of content will you be dealing with in the second phase?

Again, I can talk best about the Elementary Teachers Training Program. Phase II consists of a series of Data Banks in a number of areas--assessment/evaluation, curriculum, communication, grading/reporting, influencing behaviors, instructional management, learning environment, learning styles. Teachers will be working on these Data Banks in groups, and the goal will be to develop their skills in those individual areas. The principals training program is only a one-phase course. I've heard informally from the instructors that the principals feel they could benefit from a Phase II. We are flexible, and if there is a need, an additional phase could be developed to complement Phase I.

Is there any evaluation of teachers?

This first go-around, the teachers' attendance was the criterion for an acceptable grade. A decision was made to administer a simple exam at the end of Phase II, just so we would know whether or not the teachers did gain from the program. There'll be no term papers or anything like that, just a written exam to ascertain the knowledge level. We've also talked about doing an impact survey. We may administer a questionnaire six to nine months from now to randomly selected individuals who have participated in the inservice training, again to try to ascertain whether the process has been effective.

What kind of information resources do you see the state needing in order to supply teachers with information? Do you use ERIC or other data banks?

We use ERIC to identify inservice programs, and for individual teachers who have established programs within their school systems or in their classrooms and need additional information on a program or a particular topic. We also use our state resource consultant from the Northeast Regional Resource System, who is quite successful in identifying individuals, bibliographies, or other resources. We've used the National Association of State Directors to help us locate information that we need. I imagine we'll get more requests for information after Phase II, the content/skill building phase.

Did you have to take into consideration teachers' awareness of their own attitudes toward handicapped children?

That was done in the awareness session. It is a hard thing to do, particularly at the secondary level. Some of the activities in the training program were simulation activities which effectively portrayed teachers' concerns, and participants could acknowledge and share those concerns with other teachers in a particular setting. As we look at the course content, that was done in a number of ways: supplying accurate information, using simulation activities, getting together, talking with one another. The individual trainers are the ones who saw the actual growth with respect to attitude change from the beginning to the end; I know, however, that part of the emphasis in Phase I was definitely on changing teacher attitudes. The Texas people did say that, although their program was developed primarily for elementary and secondary teachers working with special needs students, they had good results when some special educators were in the course. We left that up to the LEA, and there were in fact both special and regular educators in some of the courses, and that also may have worked to change a few teacher attitudes.

Do you address the problem of helping teachers to sensitize the other students to the problems of handicapped children who will be returning to the classroom?

We did have a program funded in one of our local school systems to give information on handicapped individuals to the regular class students. That program was quite effective, and we would look into that as one of the programs we could possibly offer as inservice. At this point in time, that program has just been operating within one local school system, and we have had the program demonstrated at our special education instructional materials center. But that could very well be one of our inservice training programs based on the needs assessments that we will be conducting.

To what extent are handicapped students already in your regular classes?

It depends on the individual school system. Some systems have been doing it for the past two or three years; others haven't done anything. A number of school systems received federal grants some years ago for providing a resource teacher to work with learning disadvantaged (LD) children. The RITC's Alternate Learning Center also offered a program for regular teachers working with LD students in grades K-3; that program has been offered for the past three or four years. Many of the school systems requested the inservice, and as a result more and more children were given supportive help while remaining in the mainstream.

Have you used the knowledge of teachers who have already had these experiences in the development of the inservice programs?

We will, as we have decided to call in the peer trainers and get feedback from them on the effectiveness, the concerns, the loopholes in the Phase I sessions, and we'll modify the program as a result of the feedback.

Do the special educators have fears about losing their jobs, being phased out, taking second place, being only resource teachers?

I believe all special educators, and particularly teachers working with the mildly handicapped, have some concerns about losing what has been developed in the past ten years; that is, their own special education domain. "What's going to happen to me? Am I prepared to deal with the changing role that I know I'm going to have to assume?" In response to that, two new programs to be offered at another awareness conference in the fall are in the process of being discussed and developed. These are programs for special educators whose roles and responsibilities will change as a result of the new legislation. One deals with a noncategorical model, in that the special education teacher who was formerly in a self-contained classroom with mildly handicapped individuals may in fact remain in that capacity, but may also receive mildly emotionally disturbed or mildly neurologically impaired students. That teacher may have been through an academic program strictly specific to mildly mentally retarded students. Another inservice program we hope to offer would retrain special education teachers to be consulting teachers, diagnostic prescriptive teachers, resource room teachers.

Have you found the teachers responsive to this approach?

We are just in the process now of talking to the college about developing the particular training program.

Are you bringing in special education people to discuss what should be included?

There is now no formalized system to do this, but I know that Rhode Island College will communicate with those special education teachers on what their needs are.

What have you heard from the teacher organizations in the state?

When the decision was made to utilize the majority of our Title VI-D monies on on-site inservice training and adopt the mechanism of the system the Rhode

Island Teacher Center had developed, we called together a special education staff development advisory committee. We have on that committee representatives from the Rhode Island Education Association (NEA) and the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers (AFT). This committee has actually done some work on a number of tasks in special education staff development. We are making a presentation to the teachers union meeting on federal and state legislation and also on inservice. We hoped to keep them informed and involved from the beginning, right from the time we established the special education staff development advisory committee.

Could you describe some of their concerns?

There are many teacher concerns. They're worried about the IEP becoming a tool for evaluating teachers, and that's a legitimate concern. There have already been indications of that with some administrators saying, sign it. They're worried about the presence of an evaluation team. They're worried about released time and the demands on the staff. They're worried about mainstreaming and how it will affect class size.

Teacher organizations fear there will be too much pressure of evaluation on the teacher?

The teachers are afraid the Individualized Education Programs in their classrooms would be used by local administrators as an evaluative tool. But our evaluation of the inservice program consists of two steps: the on-site visits by myself and two other individuals and then the participants' feedback about what they got out of the program.

Is the IEP going to give teachers problems?

We hope that by offering this inservice program we are addressing many of the concerns of both special and regular educators. It's pretty clear in the proposed regulations that the IEP is not to be a legally binding contract. Teachers need to have that repeated a number of times in order to believe it. Some of the practical problems: How do you write short-term objectives that can be met? How formal should the input be from the team members? Who should actually sit down to write the plan? Does the plan have to be signed? Teachers definitely have questions. Many of these questions are being answered by the instructors from the College, and many others will be answered when the state comes out with guidelines. The federal legislation mandates that the state develop guidelines for the implementation and monitoring of the individualized education programs. We are in the process of contracting with an individual who will do that for us. So we're attempting to answer the questions.

Has the state been completely behind the effort to respond to PL 94-142?

I believe Rhode Island is committed to responding to the mandate. We have addressed a number of areas in the proposed regulations, such as developing state guidelines for individualized education programs and the comprehensive staff development. We knew they were coming, and that was one of the reasons we called together the staff development committee and made the decision to use the teacher center process for the Title VI-D monies that we have. So Rhode Island is committed to responding. In fact, on April 20 the Board of

Regents adopted state regulations which have been in the works for a couple of years. Those regulations parallel the mandates in PL 94-142.

Where will funding come from?

Last year, we spent $40,000 of our $70,000 Title VI-D Education of the Handicapped allocation for this on-site training. Each year we have to write an individual grant request, so for our third year of funding we requested additional money to provide more on-site inservice programs. We also have been able to utilize monies from the Northeast Regional Resource System for our inservice training programs. We have explored, and are still in the process of exploring, possibilities of other financial resources.

You're talking about the inservice programs. What about the extra costs of educating the handicapped children in the regular classrooms? I remember that federal money would meet five percent of that cost initially, and escalate gradually to forty percent. How is Rhode Island going to meet its new costs?

We do have new legislation that goes into effect in 1978 to provide additional money. There will be additional funding over a period of time, and there will be an increase, not simply a reallocation from other programs.

Do you find there is anxiety over what happens to the normal child when so much emphasis is given to the special child, a worry that the normal child will not receive adequate attention and opportunity?

Oh, yes. School committees and administrators are concerned about the new mandates, both federal and state, and about where the money is going to come from and how we are going to be able to implement all the mandates. They've indicated their concerns to the Commissioner, and the State Department of Education has been gathering figures about the additional expense to communities because of the new legislation.

Since this is a federal mandate, what is the legal responsibility of the states if they cannot afford it?

It's not really a question of whether or not they can afford it; they have to afford it. Included in the new federal mandate is that each local education agency must submit a plan to the department of education. There are certain requirements that have to be addressed in that plan. We've been told that if communities do not submit an acceptable plan, all federal funds can be cut off. That in turn would be applicable to the state as well: if we submit our annual program plan and do not address the mandates of PL 94-142, we will not receive our state allocation.

What then will happen in those states that don't comply?

They are saying they don't want federal money. I imagine there will be local lawsuits within the state on the grounds of the provision of inappropriate or inadequate education. I don't know what the federal government intends to do in that situation.

Would you describe the cooperation in your state between the local education agencies, the state department of education, and the teacher center?

Our special education staff development committee consists of representatives from institutions of higher learning, LEAs, the SEA, parents, teacher organizations. The advisory committee does include broad representation, and our goal was to establish a coordinated staff development system.

With so many perspectives represented, do you sometimes "fight things out" on that committee?

Yes; however, we are surprised that we have been able to agree and work together as well as we have to date. There has been excellent cooperation. The Special Education unit of the Department of Education has become much more aware of what the college is doing and is coordinated much more closely this year as a result of adopting the teacher center process for provision of special education inservice training.

Did you go to the teacher center first, or did they go to you? Where did the collaboration originate?

I believe we went to them. But they were interested in assisting us, and at the same time we wanted to become aware of what they might be able to do for us. Both factors came together at the same time.

What are your individual responsibilities: what does the teacher center do, and what do you do?

I work primarily with Ed Dambruch as director of the teacher center. It was his responsibility to inform the staff development committee of the teacher center process with respect to the delivery of on-site inservice programs. Following the awareness and orientation session for the advisory committee, we worked together in identifying needs assessment instruments in the area of special education. Both of us researched and checked out special education needs assessment documents. We then worked together on searching out programs. Simply put, I'm really the content and he is the process. My Special Education division was responsible for what should be included in the programs, what areas should be covered in administration of the needs assessment. One of the most positive aspects of having the Special Education unit work with the teacher center has been that we're able to provide the on-site inservice training to a much larger number of teachers rather than zeroing in on special study institutes. There is some follow-through on the inservice programs in that we present them in phases, we have brought the special education departments at the College and the State Department of Education into a much greater working relationship than there has been in the past, and we've been able to coordinate the federal dollars coming in to the state and get more for the money.

SMALL GROUP WORKSHOPS

Small group meetings gave participants the opportunity to select from among several options offered. Sessions were repeated so that each participant could attend two workshops. In each session, presenters described existing programs or projects, and answered questions or moderated discussion related to staff development for special education in teacher centers.

CHILD FIND

Ms. Judith Siegel, Child Find Consultant with the Rhode Island Department of Education, explained the state's Child Find/Placement/Service Project. As a result of out-of-court settlement in the case of The Rhode Island Society for Autistic Children, Inc., et al. vs. The Board of Regents for Education of the State of Rhode Island, et al., plaintiffs and defendants entered into several agreements in August 1975. One of the agreements, now known as the "Child Find Stipulation," addressed the preschool population, and stipulated that:

--The Department of Education would develop a state coordinated model for identification and education of all handicapped children ages three to six; this model would be suitable for adaptation to meet the specific needs of local communities and would draw upon, coordinate, and integrate existing and potential resources in the state (such as local school systems, other private and public agencies, parents).

--By March 1976 each LEA in the state would submit a plan for implementing an early recognition and intervention program for handicapped children ages three to six.

--In Spring 1976, six communities would put their Child Find/Placement/Service program into operation, so that as of September 1976 they would have implemented a full service program for handicapped children in that age group.

--As of September 1977, all Rhode Island school systems would have fully implemented such a program.

The Department of Education established the Child Find Project in October 1975 to design a full service model adaptable in local situations, to develop prototype methods and materials for implementation of the plan, and to assist local education agencies to adapt, implement, and monitor the plan within their communities. A task force consisting of 60 professionals, paraprofessionals, and parents and representing a range of disciplines, agencies, and geographic locations drafted the Child Find Plan.

Components of the plan included:

1. Casefinding--locating the parent or guardian of every child between the ages of 2 1/2 and 6 years, so that all known children with special needs may gain immediate access to preschool diagnostic and/or educational services; and informing all community individuals, agencies, and organizations of the preschool special education services available and procedures for obtaining them

2. Screening, Assessment, and Educational Planning--a step-by-step process to identify children with special needs, perform in-depth diagnostic assessments, and develop an individual educational plan
3. Carrying out the Educational Plan--services planned by professionals in consultation with parents, with each individual plan matched to the assessed needs of the identified child; procedures for monitoring and evaluating the plan
4. Staff Training--a comprehensive program with four levels of training experiences: (a) familiarization, to create awareness of and sensitivity to the special education content; (b) translation of this new information into usable knowledge to meet local needs; (c) application of the newly acquired methods, techniques, and approaches of the program, in either the local setting or a model setting; and (d) perpetuation of the program through continued development and support of school personnel.

Further information may be obtained from the Child Find Project, Rhode Island Department of Education, Providence.

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Mr. Hopkin Davies, Assistant Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education in Washington, D.C., was on hand to demonstrate the facility for computer searching the ERIC system to obtain documents pertaining to both special education/inservice education and teacher centers.

The Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is one of 16 clearinghouses in the Educational Resources Information Center, a system for gathering, abstracting, indexing, and storing documents in education. Through a monthly index, Resources in Education (RIE), ERIC makes available over 100,000 unpublished, hard-to-find documents, and cites articles from more than 700 education periodicals in another monthly publication, Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE).

Most of the documents abstracted in RIE are available in microfiche at over 600 locations, or may be ordered in either microfiche or paper copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Journal articles receive only an announcement, and are not reproduced by ERIC in any form. A computer search of the two ERIC files by use of carefully selected descriptive topics can yield a variety of practical, targeted resources from which the user can select and adapt those most suited to particular needs, Mr. Davies said.

The volume of literature in ERIC relating to IEPs, the least restrictive alternative, and other program requirements mandated by PL 94-142 is small but growing. Literature on the use of teacher centers as a delivery mechanism for the personnel preparation necessitated by PL 94-142 is even sparser. One reason for the dearth of information is that implementation of PL 94-142 is still in the developmental stages, and therefore few program and project descriptions have yet been prepared.

Professional educators in all role functions (teachers, supervisors, administrators, IHE personnel, and special educators) must have access to

relevant information which will enable them to understand, interpret, and implement PL 94-142. It is critical, therefore, that all persons engaged in the endeavor recognize and fulfill their responsibility to share information with their colleagues. This sharing of information can be accomplished through the use of several communications channels, including but not limited to professional journals, conference attendance and presentation, and the automated data bases--ERIC and Exceptional Child Abstracts.

Information about ERIC, the Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, or the Computer Mediated Bibliographic Service (COMBS) may be obtained by writing to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

Dr. Richard L. Dickson, of the Special Education Department of Rhode Island College, described an inservice training series for presentation in local education agencies on the subject of developing individualized education programs (IEPs) for all handicapped youngsters, in compliance with PL 94-142.

The intensive workshops, planned for 12 hours each, will feature active participation for professional educators. Through direct teaching and simulated experiences, participants in the first workshop will focus on the functions to be performed by the special education placement committee in the formulation of a total service plan. The second workshop will assist those with responsibilities for direct delivery of special education and related services in generating an individual implementation plan. In the third workshop, placement committee members, service providers, and state department of education professionals will consider the development of monitoring procedures and evaluative criteria. Activities of the final workshop will use a seminar format to refine skill areas identified in the first three workshops.

In his presentation to the conference participants, Dr. Dickson said that under the new regulations, teachers must do their jobs differently, but inherent in these federal and state regulations is the potential for improving the quality of education experiences for handicapped youngsters.

He stressed the importance of the Individualized Education Program, which dictates the amount, kind, duration, and anticipated effect of special education and related services. Although the specific process employed in formulating an IEP will vary from one state to another, the mandate is quite clear that special education planning and placement decisions must be made by a committee.

Those attending the session received copies of the outline for Workshop One, "Functions of the Special Education Placement Committee: Developing the Total Service Plan." The speaker urged persons interested in assistance in designing and implementing IEP training experiences to contact him at the College in Providence.

TEACHERS' CENTERS EXCHANGE

Ms. Lorraine Keeney and Dr. William Hering represented the Teachers' Centers Exchange, a project supported by the National Institute of Education (Schools Capacity for Local Problem Solving Group) and located at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in San Francisco. Staff and governance board members from several teachers' centers responded to participant questions about center philosophy, operation, and governance.

The Exchange is in contact with a network of about 100 teachers' centers in the United States; most grew out of the curriculum development movement of the 1960s, the informal education movement, and the need to create multi-ethnic curriculum and understandings. The centers in the network are work-places for teachers, and provide practical assistance to meet teachers' individual needs and the realities of the classroom. Teachers visit centers voluntarily to share practice, offer support for one another, and receive help in the development, adaptation, and implementation of innovations. Center staff assist teachers both in the centers and in their own classrooms.

The Teachers' Centers Exchange is an information and referral center for this national network of teachers' centers and inservice programs. The Exchange facilitates communication and practitioner-to-practitioner technical assistance on the basis of specific questions and requests from network members and their volunteered sharing of experience, insight, and talent. Mutual exchange is possible if basic premises and purposes are held in common: that teachers must be more than technicians, they must continue to be learners. Long-lasting improvements in education will come through inservice programs that identify individual starting points for learning in each teacher. These programs should build on teachers' motivation to take more, not less, responsibility for curriculum and instruction decisions in the school and the classroom; and must welcome teachers to participate in the design of professional development programs.

The Exchange staff can:

--Find answers for educators' (and laymen's) questions about teachers' centers and similar forms of staff development: tell about program and policy in experienced centers, refer inquirers to center leaders, make matches among people whom they perceive to hold common purposes and feel similar needs.

--Spotlight and circulate information, ideas, and themes; write descriptions of centers, case studies, articles, bibliographies. They will circulate information to those who have expressed a particular focus or problem.

--Arrange for meetings among teachers' centers people; facilitate visits to centers. They are also exploring the use of joint study projects, participation in institutes, and consultancies as ways to spread the word and practice of teachers' centers.

Teachers' centers leaders and others interested in centers as an alternative form of staff development may write the Teachers' Centers Exchange, 1855 Folsom St., San Francisco, CA 94103, or call (415) 565-3101 or 565-3108.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. Ronald DiOrio, President of the National Education Association/Rhode Island, gave a teachers' perspective of PL 94-142.

A major concern, he said, is with interpretations of what the new legislation really means, what is and is not mandated, and what the implications of that mandate are. For example, what are the implications, in terms of teacher responsibility, of the parent's signature on the Individualized Education Program? Is the IEP in fact a contract?

"Senator Albert Quie read into the Congressional Record that it would not be a contract, that the parent's signature indicated the parent had been involved in the process. But lawyers have said it is a contract. We will probably see a number of proposed amendments and a clarification of that; if not, it will end up in court, because the implications of its being a contract are phenomenal in terms of the right of the parent then to bring suit for violation of the contract."

The next problem, he said, is that the superintendents or school boards which have not been able to accomplish certain rights through the negotiations process are starting to add on a whole new layer of rules and regulations and attributing them to PL 94-142 or state regulations. This is a mistake on their part, he said.

"NEA has budgeted $500,000 to train teachers specifically about PL 94-142 and teacher centers. Since supervisory boards of teacher centers have to be 51 percent classroom teachers, the objective is not to lose control over what is going on in the LEAs through those supervisory boards as they are formed. I believe that eventually all monies for inservice education are going to be funneled through the teacher center setup. This will necessitate IHEs changing their entire operating model."

Some of the issues that are going to be on the bargaining table:

1. Class size--as you assign students to the least restrictive alternative, there is a corresponding need to decrease the number of students with whom the teacher is dealing.
2. How inservice education is handled--Who is ultimately going to have control over inservice training? What dollar amounts will be put in by LEAs in addition to the monies obtained from federal and state funding?
3. Compensation for [illegible] involved in development of IEPs--not necessarily in dollars, perhaps in time.
4. Issues which develop at the local level and pertain to that community.

AUDIENCE: Some teachers cannot teach the students who are barely or moderately retarded; they can't deal with this and certainly not with severely handicapped.

DiORIO: I think most teachers have been teaching handicapped students, but the students have not been identified as such. I don't think the intent of the legislation was ever to place a student in a classroom where the student was meeting any kind of hostility. Practical decisions do have to be made as to which teachers are handling handicapped students and which ones are not. It would not be in the best interest of a student to be placed in a classroom with a teacher whose attitude is not suited to working with the handicapped. This does not mean that person is a bad teacher; just that he/she should not handle handicapped students. Currently, a student can be placed in a class, and the teacher has no appeal process. There are no built-in mechanisms in PL 94-142; but this does not preclude the ability of the advisory committees to develop a mechanism in the vacuum, so that if a teacher does not want to or should not be involved, that determination can be made.

AUDIENCE: What do you see as concerns of teachers around PL 94-142?

DiORIO: Many teachers are becoming aware that they can't recognize some learning disabilities. Teachers are going to want some very specific instruction on how to develop IEPs, and some very clear answers on what are their responsibilities and liabilities. An important variable is whether parents are going to work with students to continue at home the educational objectives developed in the classroom. Teachers in special education are going to ask for training in working with other teachers. Training is going to be needed in the development of skills as they are applied to relationships with other professionals and with parents and community.

AUDIENCE: What are the provisions for the review and evaluation of IEPs? To whom is that reported?

DiORIO: It would be a mistake to try to relate students' achievement of the IEP with any kind of teacher evaluation. Our concern is what the objective should be of any evaluation procedure. If a review/evaluation of IEPs is developed to fire teachers, then we are going to have problems. If it is being developed to promote the quality of the relationship between that student learning and that teacher teaching, then making a judgment of the teacher's ability based on accomplishment or non-accomplishment of IEPs is a disaster.

AUDIENCE: Do you think it is NEA's responsibility to warn the teacher of this trap and that trap? If you take too much of an advisory position, you can lose everything we have gained.

DiORIO: I'm afraid only of losing what we've gained for children. I'm not concerned about the public image of teachers. I think that's a myth. We need to get the government to rearrange its priorities so education is recognized as being important to this country. We are mobilizing teachers to get those public officials who are into only rhetoric out of public office.

MAINSTREAMING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY PRINCIPALS

Ms. Mary Costello elaborated on a model, described in an earlier general session, for the delivery of special education inservice to acquaint principals with the implications of PL 94-142. The model, a one-credit, 16-hour course,

was developed cooperatively by the RITC and the Rhode Island Department of Education's Division of Special Education.

The multimedia program presents principals with 12 problems to solve, to help them understand: (a) the rationale for educating the handicapped student in the regular classroom to the extent possible; (b) administrative and instructional considerations of this placement in the least restrictive setting; and (c) practical methods of administering a special education program in the school.

The Principals Training Program:

--Places the participant in a problem situation which needs a solution.

--Provides printed and audiovisual resources for the participant to use to collect data for seeking a solution to the problem.

--Places the participant in an individualized instructional setting.

--Uses simulation techniques.

--Uses the small group as the primary instructional organization, but also includes some large group activity.

--Relies on the participant to be actively involved, to take responsbility for his own learning, to work independently, to collect data, and to take responsibility for sharing the data with the group.

REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS

A presentation regarding the resources of the Regional Resource Center (RCC) Network was made by Judy DiMeo, Ann Connelly, and Pamela Tetley, representing Region 9, the Northeast RRC. Discussion centered on the past multistate (New England and New Jersey) activities, including regional conferences on such topics as Non-Biased Assessment, Early Childhood Special Education, and Severe and Profoundly Handicapped.

The presenters stressed the information base and sharing opportunities afforded by the regional activities. Additionally, interstate communication links and intrastate efficiency of activities were found to have a positive impact within Region 9.

A new Request for Proposal (RFP #77-58) has been developed, with compliance to the Individual Education Program provision of PL 94-142 as the major thrust of the RFP. Assistance will be provided through RRC centers beginning in October 1977.

DUE PROCESS

Mr. Richard M. Flynn, legal consultant for the State Departments of Education in New Jersey and Rhode Island, spoke on "Due Process and Personnel Devel-

opment Under the Requirements of PL 94-142." Under PL 94-142, he said, due process can come into play because the parent and the school district can challenge the evaluation, classification, and educational placement of the pupil. Questions of concern to the conference participants include: What is the role of the teacher under the due process provisions of the law? How can teachers help the school system in carrying out the mandates, and how can the school system educate its teachers to the new mandates?

Mr. Flynn pointed out that the mandates can be incorporated not only in state regulations but also in other procedures, such as memorandums of agreement with various education institutions, or directives to the local districts to follow certain procedures in order to receive funding. The question to ask about any particular provision, he said, is whether it is a hard and fast rule that should be in the state regulations, or is an innovation with which the local district or the state education agency may want to experiment for a while.

He gave as an example the concept of the parent surrogate: the state has the option of establishing the regulations on how the surrogate will be chosen and at what point those regulations become operative. "Since the parent surrogate will be a new concept in most states, my recommendation was that the implementation be carried out in a memorandum. Essentially, the memo would give the requirements, and you could address the very difficult questions, such as whether the parent surrogate would come into operation if the parents are merely uncooperative, as opposed to unavailable. The reason for putting this in the memorandum and allowing the districts to experiment is that if you lock it into the regulations and later want to change it, you have to go through a long procedure.

"Generally, you want to include in the regulations those things necessary to prevent abuse--the IEP provisions, the hearing process. I don't believe it should be left up to local districts to establish due process procedures because so many fundamental legal rights are involved."

The speaker stressed that teachers have an integral role in the due process provision of PL 94-142 because they deal on a day-to-day basis with the students; it is they who will see whether a particular child is making progress, and whether the classroom is no longer the appropriate, or the least restrictive, environment. Teachers also probably will be called into hearings, to give testimony and to talk about the proper classifications of students. "The 'least restrictive environment' provision is going to lead to extensive litigation, so teachers should understand the idea. Teachers should be apprised of the whole thrust of the law."

The law does establish a procedure for resolution of disputes, he said. That procedure includes notice, a hearing before an impartial hearing examiner, and a formal hearing. "But districts should keep in mind that nothing in PL 94-142 prevents the districts from working out some informal due process--such as meeting with the supervisor of special education, the parent, and perhaps the teacher, and explaining to the parent why a certain decision is being made. By bringing the parents in on an informal level, and acquainting them with the people working with their child, you are keeping them abreast of what is happening and letting them know there is no stigma attached to being

handicapped. We can instill confidence in the parents; and, in a pragmatic way, we can save the school district and agencies thousands of dollars that will be spent on formal hearings. The parents will soon see that the federal mandates are in the best interests of their handicapped child."

APPENDIX A

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS
(Excerpts)

Teacher Centers

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies to assist such agencies in planning, establishing, and operating teacher centers.

. . . The term "teacher center" means any site operated by a local educational agency (or a combination of such agencies) which serves teachers, from public and nonpublic schools of a State, or an area or community within a State, in which teachers, with the assistance of such consultants and experts as may be necessary, may--

1. Develop and produce curricula designed to meet the educational needs of the persons in the community, area, or State being served, including the use of educational research findings or new or improved methods, practices, and techniques in the development of such curricula; and
2. Provide training to improve the skills of teachers to enable such teachers to meet better the special educational needs of persons such teachers serve, and to familiarize such teachers with developments in curriculum development and educational research, including the manner in which the research can be used to improve their teaching skills.

Each teacher center shall be operated under the supervision of a teacher center policy board, the majority of which is representative of elementary and secondary classroom teachers to be served by such center. . . . Such board shall also include individuals representative of, or designated by, the school board of the local educational agency served by such center, and at least one representative designated by the institutions of higher education (with departments or schools of education) located in the area.

. . . Each application [by any local educational agency] shall be submitted through the State educational agency of the State in which the applicant is located. Each such State agency shall review the application, make comments thereon, and recommend each application the State agency finds should be approved. Only applications so recommended shall be transmitted to the Commissioner for his approval. . . .

Any local educational agency having an application approved . . . may contract with an institution of higher education to carry out activities under, or provide technical assistance in connection with, such application.

Notwithstanding . . . the requirement that teacher centers be operated by local educational agencies, 10 per centum of the funds expended . . . may be expended directly by the Commissioner to make grants to institutions of higher education to operate teacher centers. . . .

Training for Higher Education Personnel

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to assist such institutions in the training of individuals--

1. Preparing to serve as teachers, including guidance and counseling personnel, administrative personnel, or education specialists in institutions of higher education if such individuals are from cultural or educational backgrounds which have hindered such individuals in achieving success in the field of education, or preparing to serve in educational programs designed to meet the special needs of students from such backgrounds; or
2. Serving as teachers, including guidance and counseling personnel, administrative personnel, or education specialists in institutions of higher education, if such individuals are to be trained to meet changing personnel needs, such as in areas determined to be national priority areas. . . .

Grants made under this section may be used only to assist in paying the cost of courses of training or study, including short term or regular institutes, symposia or other inservice training, for teachers, including guidance and counseling personnel, administrative personnel, or educational specialists in institutions of higher education.

APPENDIX B

EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(Excerpts)

Comprehensive System of Personnel Development

Scope of system. Each annual program plan must include a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development which includes:

1. The inservice training of general and special educational, instructional, related services, and support personnel;
2. Procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained, and that activities sufficient to carry out this personnel development plan are scheduled; and
3. Effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicapped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through those projects. . . .

Participation of other agencies and institutions. The State educational agency must insure that all public and private institutions of higher education, and other agencies and organizations (including representatives of handicapped, parent, and other advocacy organizations) in the State which have an interest in the preparation of personnel for the education of handicapped children, have an opportunity to participate fully in the development, review, and annual updating of the comprehensive system of personnel development. . . .

Inservice training. . . . Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency:

1. Conducts an annual needs assessment in cooperation with institutions of higher education to determine if a sufficient number of adequately and appropriately prepared and trained personnel are available in the State; and
2. Initiates inservice personnel development programs based on the assessed needs of State-wide significance related to the implementation of the Act.

Each annual program plan must include the results of the needs assessment . . . broken out by need for new personnel and need for retrained personnel. . . .

The State educational agency may enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies or other agencies, institutions, or organizations (which may include parent, handicapped, or other advocacy organizations), to carry out: (a) experimental or innovative personnel development programs, (b) development or modification of instructional materials, and (c) dissemination of significant information derived from educational research and demonstration projects.

Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency insures that ongoing inservice training programs are available to all personnel who are engaged in the education of handicapped children, and that these programs include:

1. The use of incentives which insure participation by teachers (such as released time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, salary step credit, certification renewal, or updating professional skills);
2. The involvement of local staff; and
3. The use of innovative practices which have been found to be effective.

Each annual program plan must:

1. Describe the process used in determining the inservice training needs of personnel engaged in the education of handicapped children;
2. Identify the areas in which training is needed (such as individualized education programs, non-discriminatory testing, least restrictive environments, procedural safeguards, and use of parent surrogates in due process hearings);
3. Specify the groups requiring training (such as special teachers, regular teachers, administrators, psychologists, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical education teachers, therapeutic recreation specialists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, medical personnel, parents, volunteers, hearing officers, and parent surrogates);
4. Describe the content and nature of training for each area under paragraph 2 of this section;
5. Describe how the training will be provided in terms of (a) geographical scope (such as Statewide, regional, or local), and (b) staff training source (such as college and university staffs, State and local educational agency personnel, and non-agency personnel);
6. Specify: (a) the funding sources to be used, and (b) the time frame for providing it; and
7. Specify procedures for effective evaluation of the extent to which program objectives are met. . . .

Dissemination. Each annual program plan must include a description of the State's procedures for acquiring, reviewing, and disseminating to general and special educational instructional and support personnel, administrators of programs for handicapped children, and other interested agencies and organizations (including parent, handicapped, and other advocacy organizations) significant information and promising practices derived from educational research, demonstration, and other projects. . . .

Adoption of educational practices. Each annual program plan must provide for a statewide system designed to adopt, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials proven effective through research and demonstration.

Each annual program plan must provide for thorough reassessment of educational practices used in the State.

Each annual program plan must provide for the identification of State, local, and regional resources (human and material) which will assist in meeting the State's personnel preparation needs.

Evaluation. The annual program plan must include:

1. Procedures for evaluating the overall effectiveness of:
   a. The comprehensive system of personnel development in meeting the needs for personnel, and
   b. The procedures for administration of the system; and
2. A description of the monitoring activities that will be undertaken to assure the implementation of the comprehensive system of personnel development.

Each annual program plan must include a description of technical assistance that the State educational agency gives to local educational agencies in their implementation of the State's comprehensive system of personnel development.

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS

This list is intended to facilitate continued communication among participants, and includes the names of some individuals who were not in attendance but who expressed interest in the outcome of the conference.

CHARLES ACHILLES
Executive Secretary, Public Schools Cooperative Research
College of Education
Educational Administration Annex
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37196

BRUCE BALOW
Professor of Special Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

PENNY BARHAM
Reidsville City Schools
Reidsville, NC 27320

THEODORE BECK
Special Education Services
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909

KAS BENDINER
Associate Director
PAF Center
97 Little Neck Road
Centerport, NY 11721

LESLIE BERNAL
Merrimack Education Center
101 Mill Road
Chelmsford, MA 01824

HAROLD BICKEL
College of Education
University of South Alabama
307 University Boulevard
Mobile, AL 36688

CARLA BORG
75 Milton Avenue
Hyde Park, MA 02136

JEAN BORG
University of South Florida
College of Education
Tampa, FL 33620

PATRICIA BOUREXIS
Apartment 13
105 Remington Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13210

MADELINE BRAFFORD
College of Human Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

BARBARA BRITTINGHAM
Director, Curriculum Research and Development Center
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI 02881

OTIS BRUNSON
Mobile County Board of School Commissioners
P.O. Box 1327
Mobile, AL 36601

BETTY CANTRELL
Teacher Corps/Clay Elementary
Clay, WV 25043

EDWARD CASEY
Executive Secretary
RI Federation of Teachers
171 Pawtucket Avenue
Pawtucket, RI 02860

SIMON CHAVEZ
Chairman, Department of Elementary Education
University of Dayton
300 College Avenue
Dayton, OH 45469

CHERYL CHRISTENSEN
Teacher Center/Inservice Coordinator
1401 Greenwood Road
Glenview, IL 60025

JAMES COLLINS
Teacher Corps Project
University of Syracuse
Syracuse, NY 13210

ANNE CONNELLY
Special Projects Division of
Special Education
178 Tremont Street
Boston, MA 02111

MARY COSTELLO
Special Education Consultant
Rhode Island Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908

ANGELA COVERT
Associate for Program Development
Bank Street College
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

RONALD CROWELL
Teacher Corps
Department of Teacher Education
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

EDWARD L. DAMBRUCH
Director, Teacher Center
Rhode Island Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908

JEAN DAMES
Consultant, Professional
Development Center
112 North Belmont Avenue
Arlington Heights, IL 60004

HOPKIN DAVIES
Assistant Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

JOAN DEASON
College of Human Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

KATHLEEN DEVANEY
Far West Laboratory
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

RICHARD DICKSON
Special Education Department
Rhode Island College
600 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Providence, RI 02908

JUDY DiMEO
Staff Development Coordinator
Special Education Department
Rhode Island College
600 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Providence, RI 02908

RONALD L. DiORIO
President, National Education
Association/Rhode Island
300 Hennessey Avenue
North Providence, RI 02911

HANK DOWSKI
Assistant Professor of Education
State University College at Buffalo
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, NY 14222

JOAN RAMSAY DVORAK
American Conservatory of Music
116 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603

JOHN FAVORS
Coordinator, Bay Area
Learning Center
1025 Second Avenue
Oakland, CA 94606

RICHARD M. FLYNN
412 Highland Boulevard
Gloucester City, NJ 08030

EUGENE FOSTER
Assistant Professor
Providence College
River and Eaton Streets
Providence, RI 02908

THOMAS GALLAHER
Leader Corporation
555 Constitution Avenue
Norman, OK 73037

JOSEPH GILMORE
55 Elk Street
Albany, NY 12234

KAT GOOTEE
Indiana University
Purdue University
Division of Education
902 North Meridian Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

HARVIE GUEST
Executive Director, Organizational
Development
11285 Highline Drive
Denver, CO 80233

MARGARET GRAGG
College of Human Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

GEORGE S. HAINES
Director of Teacher Education
Taylor University
Upland, IN 46989

RICHARD HARRING
Project Director
Western Michigan University
College of Education
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

CHARLES HARRINGTON
Coordinator, Special Education
Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908

JASPER HARVEY
Director, Division of Personnel
Preparation, Bureau of
Education for the Handicapped
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Donahue Building
Washington, DC 20014

WILLIAM HERING
Teachers' Centers Exchange,
Far West Laboratory
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

RICHARD HERSH
Associate Dean/Teacher Education
University of Oregon
College of Education
Eugene, OR 97403

R. FOUNT HOLLAND
Northeastern Oklahoma State University
Tahlequah, OK 74464

RAYMOND HOPPER
Superintendent
Board of Education
Montgomery County Schools
431 West Third Street
Dayton, OH 45402

ROBERTA HOWELLS
State Department of Education,
Teacher Center
State Office Building
Hartford, CT 06115

KENNETH HOWEY
2605 Silver Lane, NE
Minneapolis, MN 55421

SARA IRBY
Assistant Supervisor, Title VI-D
7323 East Grace Street
Richmond, VA 23216

MARILYN JENDE
Coordinator, Montgomery County Schools
and University of Dayton
Board of Education
451 West Third Street
Dayton, OH 45402

KENNETH JENKINS
College of Human Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

LORRAINE KEENEY
Teachers' Centers Exchange,
Far West Laboratory
1019 East Capitol Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

JAMES KIDD
201 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701

GORDON KLOPH
Provost and Dean of the Faculties
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

PATRICIA LANDRESS
Tri-County Teacher Education Center
Highlands County School Board
Sebring, FL 33870

LIONEL LAUER
13th Street West of Spring Garden
Philadelphia, PA 19023

ALFRED W. MACCARONE
Social Studies Coordinator
Beverly Public Schools
Beverly, MA 01915

GORDON MACK
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

KATHRYN MADDOX
MITEC Director
200 Elizabeth Street
Charleston, WV 24311

ROBERT MAI
Educational Confederation
4501 Westminster
St. Louis, MO 63108

PHIL MAKURAT
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 West Main Street
Whitewater, WI 53190

LYNDA MANTON
College of Human Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

KENNETH H. McKINLEY
Education Research & Projects
001 Classroom Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074

JOSEPH McLAUGHLIN
Providence College
Eaton and River Streets
Providence, RI 02908

ELEANOR McMAHON
Rhode Island College
600 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Providence, RI 02908

ROY MILBURY
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

ANN MARIE FROSTIG MILLER
Central Connecticut College
New Britain, CT 06050

JOSEPH MURPHY
College of Human Development
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

KATHERINE O'DONNELL
610 West 112th Street
New York, NY 10025

LANA PIPES
Editor, ERIC Clearinghouse
on Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 616
Washington, DC 20036

ADA PURYEAR
Administrator of Early Childhood
Education
221 Center Building
Department of Education
Tallahassee, FL 32204

NATHANIAL RADFORD
1414 Clay Street
Springfield, IL 62703

ARNETTE RAUSCHELE
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62702

JOHN REYNOLDS
920 John Street
Reidsville, NC 27320

WILLIAM J. RICKETTS
Clarke County Board of Education
P.O. Box 428
Grove Hill, AL 36451

MARSHA RUDMAN
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

LOUISE SANCHIONE
165 Alden Avenue
New Haven, CT 06515

BETTY SCHANTZ
Box 36
Island Route
Lock Haven, PA 17745

THOMAS C. SCHMIDT
Commissioner, Rhode Island
Department of Education
199 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908

ALLEN SCHMIEDER
Director, Teacher Center Program, USOE
Regional Office Building #3, Room 5652
7th and D Streets, SW
Washington, DC 20202

JAMES SHAVER
Bureau of Research Services
Utah State University
UMC 28
Logan, UT 84322

JUDITH SIEGEL
Child Find Consultant
Rhode Island Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908

ALBERT SMITH
Illinois Office of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62702

H. ALLAN SPROLES
FAO 158 College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

LaVIER L. STAVEN
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, KS 67601

JOHN R. SULLIVAN
Executive Secretary, NES
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02160

PAMELA TETLEY
Special Education Resource Center
275 Windsor Street
Hartford, CT 06120

THOMAS TOOMEY
State University College
Courtland, NY 13045

DON WACLETER
Director of Instruction
Townsend Building
Dover, DE 19901

STEVEN WAGNER
Coordinator, Special Education
School of Education
5500 State College Parkway
San Bernandino, CA 92407

KATHERINE L. WALLIN
P.O. Box 426
Glassboro Woodbury Road
Pitman, NJ 08071

WILLIAM WARD
Northeastern Oklahoma State University
Tahlequah, OK 74464

ELIZABETH WATERS
Associate Professor
Department of Elementary Education
University of Dayton
300 College Avenue
Dayton, OH 45469

PATRICIA WILLIAMS
University of South Alabama
307 University Boulevard
Mobile, AL 36688

ROBERT E. YAGER
Science Education Center
University of Iowa
45B Physics Building
Iowa City, IA 52242

BETTY WEITHERS
Coordinator, Title VI-B, E.H.A.
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612

READER RESPONSE

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a nationwide information system of the National Institute of Education, whose basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents in education, and to publicize the availability of such documents. Through a network of specialized clearinghouses, ERIC gathers, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes these materials, and processes them into a central computerized data system. The scope of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is the preparation and continuing development of education personnel, as well as selected aspects of health education, physical education, and recreation education.

We are convinced that the knowledge base for the subjects treated in this publication--teacher centers and the education of handicapped children in the least restrictive environment--is in need of expansion, and that the profession, collectively and individually, has a responsibility to help in this endeavor. We are encouraging you, therefore, to submit to us any manuscript you have developed on these topics, and to encourage your colleagues to do the same.

We need a reproducible copy (two copies, if available) of any materials and, if possible, a brief abstract. Documents submitted are selected on the basis of their relevance to the current needs of the field. Those accepted are abstracted and indexed in the monthly journal, Resources in Education (RIE), and are made available in microfiche at over 600 locations and reproduced in xerographic form through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Copyrighted materials will receive only an announcement in RIE if permission to reproduce is not received.

Documents announced in RIE typically are unpublished or of limited distribution, and include research reports, program descriptions, speeches, annotated bibliographies, and curriculum guides. Dissertations available elsewhere are not announced in RIE.

We believe there are benefits in submitting documents to ERIC. Your research will be widely publicized since more than 5,300 organizations subscribe to Resources in Education. Publications that have limited distribution or are out of print can continuously be made available to readers through the microfiche collections and reproduction service. And you will be performing a professional service for your colleagues.

Please send relevant documents to:

Information Analyst
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Suite 616, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036